A REIOYNDER TO DOCTOR HIL CONCERNING *THE DESCENSE OF CHRIST* INTO HELL.

*WHEREIN THE ANSWERE TO HIS SER-*mon is juſtlie defended, and the rouſt of his reply ſcraped from thoſe arguments as cleanlie, as if they *had neuer bene touched with that canker.*

By *Alexander Hume*, Maiſter of Artes.

¶ HEERE, BESIDES THE REIOYNDER, thou haſt his Paralogiſmes: that is, his fallacies and deceits in reaſon pointed out, and numbered in the margin: amounting to the nomber of 600. and aboue; and yet not half reckoned.

4° H. 15

ad Essexium

Non addit lampas splendentj lumina phœbo
augent nec lucem lumina nostra tuam.
Si fugio damnum mimtantis fulmina nubis:
hoc claris radijs debeo clare tuis.



TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE, ROBERT ERLE *OF ESSEX AND EWE, VICOVNT* Hereford and Bourchier, Lord Ferreis *of Chartlie, Lord Bourchier and Lo-* vane, Maiſter of her Majeſties *horſes, and Knight of the moſt* noble order of the Garter:

LONG LIFE WITH INCREASE OF *Honour, and after this lyfe* lyfe euerlaſting.

BEing drawne (Right honorable) into this controverſie by the accidents expreſſed in the Epiſtle to the Reader: I levelled all my labours, to rake vp the coales, and ſtifle the flames of contention. Being priuate, I endevoured to keepe my ſelfe within the boundes of my condition. I wrote in ſecrete, acquainting fewe with my counſell. I tempered my ſtile with the modeſteſt words that I could deviſe I ſubmitted my ſelf to be led by better reaſons. I abſtained from offences, & occaſions of choller. I wrote in latine, that it might not come into the handes of the

multitude: hoping that if anie blowes fell harder, then I meant them, they might be the better taken, the fewer saw them. But all this seed bred no corne: for M. Doct. hunting after præferment (if I mistake not his plot) and setting the foundation of his praise on this conquest, hath now published in print, that I wrote in a corner, & cried at the crosse, that I sent vnder seale. If the worste were my disgrace, it might be borne with: or if all readers had learning, this reply might be contemned. But seeing this cause is Christs, and slips amongest the simple may goe for six pence: I will not betray him, that hath done so much for mee, nor see them deceaued, whome he hath bought so dearlie. The question is of an article of our faith, and pertaineth to all, that care what they beleeue. The doubt is not, whether the article be true, but in what sense it is true. For, seing these articles are not scripture, but grounded on the Scripture: the question is, in what sense Christ is said according to the Scriptures, to descend into Hell. And now seeing hee is no more a Christian, that is ignorant of his faith, then he a Carpenter, that cānot handle his axe: this must needs be a question as necessarie, as it is needfull for a Christian to vnderstand, what he beleeueth. For that, which manie saie, it sufficeth to knowe that Christ descended into Hell, though they knowe not in what sort he was there; is as if a farmer shoulde content himself, that hee hath a lease of his farme, and neuer enquire how long it lasteth, nor on what condition hee holdeth. By the same reason it is sufficiēt to know that Christ was born, and that he suffered: and needlesse to seeke how he was

borne

borne, and what hee ſuffered. Wherefore, I haue reſolued to ſtand at my defenſe, and to beare the brunt of theſe blowes. For, my weapons are ſound Syllogiſmes, my armour Scripture, and truth my ſhield. I doubt not of the proofe, and feare not the muſcate. I was brief before as the mediocritie of a private letter requyred. My breuitie bred obſcuritie, and gaue more probabilitie to his inverſions and euaſions: to his inſinuations and collections, to his making and marring my argumentes in wrong mouldes. But now I haue made them my ſelf, & ſhaped them on ſuch blockes, as will not (I hope) be eaſilie wrung out of faſhion. I haue turned his ordinance ſome againſt himſelf, and all from vs. ſo farre as I hope he will diſpair himſelf, to hit this marke with that ſhot. Yet becauſe manie mindes are ſwayed with affection of the man, or with conceit of the matter: and my name came neuer neere ſo manie eares, as this booke is like to come in mouths: I haue reſolued to commend it to your honor. Hoping, that if your name win minds to read: the waight of my reaſons, ſhall turne the ſcales, and winne heartes to beleeue. I haue manie reaſons of my choiſe. Your Zeale of Gods houſe. Your loue of Gods glorie, Your knowledge in Gods worde. And your eſtimation, in Gods Church, amongeſt ſuch, as loue his name ſincerly and her Maieſtie (for his ſake) vntainedlie. Adde, that M. D. Reynoldes, (the load ſtarre of Oxenford) whome your honour hath maintained there, to confute the Fryar Bellarmine, hauing laid open all the plaites, and ript the ſeames of this controuerſie: I preſume the more to vſe your name in this cauſe, which hath beene

maintained vnder your countenance. If there were any hope, that that worke would come out ſhortlie, I would burie my papers in the duſte. But ſeeing that time is like to be long, and manie in the meane time are deceaved with theſe bold bragges. I haue thought expedient (to amaze the adverſaries of this doctrine with the light of that ſunne, when it ſhall pleaſe God to giue it to his Church) to ſet out my little candle, wherein (I hope) there is light inough, to diſperſe the miſtes, and pearce the cloudes of theſe Sophiſmes. Thus, beſeeching God (the authour of all honour) to augment your honour, to your comfort, & his glorie, I commit you to him, whoſe cauſe I commend to you.

Your Honours humble Oratour,

ALEXANDER HYME.

TO THE READER.

I Am forced (gentle Reader) though I hate contention, to contend with a contentious man: or elſe, having the better end of the ſtaffe, to forſake a good cauſe. It is not poſsible that the Lordes fielde ſhould want tares, nis net bad fiſhe, or his Church offences: but wo to them, by whome they riſe. This wo in controverſies pertaines to the one ſide. It is hard, (and almoſt impoſsible, that both bee guiltie. Wherefore, as I am cleare before the Lord, ſo, to purge my ſelfe before thee, I will ſet down how this diſſenſion firſt beganne. The Biſhop of Salisburie that laſt was, before his remooving to Yorke, tooke order, that certaine preachers ſhould keepe lecture on the market daies, in the cheefe market townes of his Dioceſe. There is a great market euerie Satterday at a towne called Chippenhame, in North Wilſhire. Within 4. myles of which, dwelleth one M. Wiſedome, a man for integritie of lyfe, and exceeding paines in his calling loued of all the godlie, hated of the wicked and admired of both. This man was one of the prechers appointed to that place, and preached there once in a fourtnight, or a month, I know not which. Wherfore on Satterday the 14. day of Februarie or thereabout *Anno* 1589. expounding in that place the articles of the beleef, he deliuered this opinion, which I defend, concerning the deſcenſe of Chriſt into hel. Whē he had done, one Chalfont Vicar of that towne

ſtood vp, and proteſted to the people, that hee had taught falſe doctrine: and promiſed, that if they would come that day ſeuen night, they ſhould heare him confuted by a learned man.. That day ſeuen-night commes. The people flockes to the Church in great multituds, exſpecting ſome famous man, with ſome new matter. At length, in came this. M. Chalfont himſelf. Hee climbes into the pulpit, and pyles vp a heap of books, as high as his head. Then after a pſalme, and a formall prayer, hee beginnes like an Oratour at his own perſon and his adverſaries, that he was M. Wiſedomes ſenior, that he was a Bachelor when M. Wiſedome was a Scholler: and a Maiſter of Arte. before he was a Bachelour. That hee had read more, and knew more, then he. That he had learned arithmetick, and could reckon the articles of the creed, better then hee. That there was 12. of them, made by the 12. Apoſtles. That his memorie ſerued him to remember, which Apoſtle made which article. That M. Wiſedome did reckon them wrong, and made but 11. of them. That al learned Fathers were on his conſpiracie. That M. Wiſedome did falſefie Calvine, and other learned writers: That Chriſt might bee the day when he ſuffered, aswell both in Paradice and Hell: as M. Wiſedome was that morning at Gritleton (that is the place where he dwelleth) & then there vnder the pulpit. That he did contradict the convocation, and therefore had depriued himſelfe of the Miniſtrie, *ipſo facto*. And ſo was no more Parſon of Gritleton, then hee was Biſhop of London. He lookes downe manie times on M. Wiſdome, where he ſat vnder the pulpite, amazed at his impudencie, like a meeke ſheep, (as hee is indeede) and calles him by his name. This ſaieth Auguſtine, this ſaieth Ierome, this ſaieth Cyprian, and you ſay that. Where was your learning? Where was your rea-

reading? Where was your ſimplicitie and plain dealing, which you make ſhow of? And turning to the people he warned them to be ware of falſe Prophets that going in ſheepes clothing, were inwardlie rauening wolues, meaning M. Wiſedome becauſe of his plainneſſe, and ſimplicitie. This exclamation, (for ſermon I cannot call it) being ended, the people departed ſome ſaying this, and ſome ſaying that: and all, (ſauing ſuch as loue, or malice did carrie more then truth or matter) condemning Chalfonts impudencie. That day ſeuen-night, the people meets againe, hoping to heare M. Wiſdome reply, for that was his day by the Biſhops order. But M. Hil beeing then at a towne called Leycocke, within 2. myles of this Chippenhame by accident, or of ſet purpoſe, I know not, came thither that morning, and tooke the place. The ſame man not manie yeares before, had dipped in the ſame controuerſy almoſt after the ſame manner at Sarum, againſt one M. Connam, a man both learned, and Chaplane to my L. of Pembroke. But to let that paſſe, at this ſermon 28. Feb. *Anno* 1589. I was my ſelfe, vpon the occaſions expreſſed in the beginning of my letter to M. Hill, (for as yet he was not Doctor) which he hath printed. In it with painted words, and great names of Doctors he ſo varniſhed the matter, that at the firſt hearing it ſeemed not improbable. Towards his aduerſaries hee behaued himſelfe modeſtlie, geuing them the praiſe both of learning and godlineſſe, namely Calvine and Beza. To blaze their error in this point, he rubbed the Hebrew words Sheol and nepheſhe, and the greeke *hades*, *pſyche* & *pneuma*, as white, as a whetſtone. Then after a ſolempne challenge to all the learned men in the world, that did diſſent from him, he offered his notes to anie that would haue them: he promiſed faire play, if anie man would anſwere

him: he proteſted loue to him, that coulde confute him: and vowed a recantation in the ſame place, if his forces could not bide the battle. I hearing this braue challenge, and miſtruſting his cardes for all his facing: wrought a freend that had acquaintance with him, to help mee to his notes. After two moneths or there-abouts, hee ſent them to mee vnder his owne hand. Peruſing them, I found them out of their coullours, nothing anſwerable to the ſhewe that they made in the pulpite. Wherefore, hearing of no man, that did reply: ſaving M. Wiſdome in a ſermon that M. Hill was not at: and hoping that his proteſtations had beene as farre in his heart, as they were faire in his mouth: I reſolued to anſwere him for the truthes ſake, though my leaſure was not much, promiſing my ſelf as much thank for my labour, as his great offers led mee to beleeue. To keep it ſecrete, I wrote in latine. I ſeaſoned my wordes, with all moderation, that might bee in a contrarie ſtyle. I offered to confeſſe, if it could be ſhewed, that my anſweres turned not the edge of his argumentes. To be ſhort, I promiſed to yeelde to anie truth, that he could proue. I was in hope that this conference ſhould haue beene priuate, amongeſt vs, and ſuch freends onelie, as hee or I, might haue acquainted with it. Indeed, he offered mee to haue talked of the matter at a freends houſe. But I conſidering, that in ſuch diſputations, ſtormes of wordes ryſing out of hearts, heated with contradiction, doth hinder reaſon, and ſtop iudgement, refuſed any conference, but with the pen. This reply I finiſhed within few daies: But miſtruſting mine own infirmities, and knowing that δεύτεραι φρονηίδες σοφωτέραι, I kept it in my hand till the next May following. Then going home to viſite my naturall freendes, I left it with a freend or two to be deliuered him. They beeing doubtfull of my

The ſecond conſideration is better than the firſt.

my returne, though it not beſt to ſturre a coale, that they knew no man in my abſence to put out. At my returne vnderſtanding that they had not deliuered it: I tooke it into my handes againe, I added and altered diuerſe things. I wrote it new: and ſent it him incloſed in a letter. In time of my abſence, (which was halfa yeare and more) he had receaued by ſome ſecret meanes, an engliſhe copie of the firſt draught, which I my ſelfe had tranſlated at the requeſt of a freend, not aboue fiue daies before my journey. It I deliuered him with condition to bring it mee againe He brought it not, and I forgot it. In time of my abſence, he lent it to another, & the other gaue a coppie of it to one, that put it in M. Hills hands. To that before my returne, he had fumbled vp this anſwere, that now he hath printed. I not knowing it, ſent him (as I haue ſaid) the latine. Vpon receit whereof hee ſent the other amongſt his freends. It went amongſt them from one to another, from November (for in Nouember I ſent mine,) till the September following and then he ſent it mee. In this meane time ſpeaches were giuen out, that I had anſwered his ſermō, that he had replied, and I recanted. Theſe ſpeeches grew dailie, and lifted his heart as high as his name. Whereon hee reſolued to diſpute in Oxenford for a ſcarlet hood. He promiſed his freends to make that one of his queſtions. He gaue out, that al Oxford was on his ſide. But when it came to proof, hee was faine to promiſe to his friends, and they to others, that he would conferre with learned men: that hee woulde yeeld to anie truth, that could be proued out of the word: that he would not deall in that queſtion, but as he ſhould be led by ſuch conference, or els he had gone as graceles out of Oxford, as he came thither. Notwithſtanding, when he was ſure of his grace, to maintain his credit amongſt his friends in the cun-

The admitting of a man to a degree of ſchoole in Oxford is called a grace.

trie: he took that queſtion to maintaine in Oxfoord on the Viper day of the Act. howe manfully hee defended it, I report me to them that heard him. *A filius terræ* at the lower end of the ſchoole (a thing neuer ſeene before in that place at that time) got a placet of the Doctor of the chyre, to bruſh his skarlet gowne: who trimmed it ſo neatly, that if his cheeks wold haue taken the ſtaines of ſhame, he had worne as much skarlet in his face, as he did on his back. In this ſtory (thou maieſt ſee good Reader) that my adverſary did thruſt his hooke in an other mans harueſt at Chippinhame: that he took not my reply ſo wel as he promiſed in the pulpit. That he made that publick which I wrote in private. That he went farther abroad, & hunted for contention in Oxfoord. That hee plaied at the ſame bale before, in Sarum. That he bare the ſimple in hand, that all the learned of the Vniverſitie were of his mind. That hee fed an vntrue rumour, that I had recanted. That he printed my privat letter without my conſent or knowledg. And that to trouble the ſimple with it, he publiſhed that in engliſh, which I wrote in latine. For my part I hope I did nothing but that which the dutie of a Chriſtian required. hearing the trueth impugned I did defend it: fearing that he had bene deceiued on ſimplicitie, I laboured to reforme him. I wrote in faire tearmes to avoide offences. I wrote in a ſtrange tongue to keepe it ſecret. And I hunted not for this contention: but was drawen into it with faire promiſes of great thanks: wherfore I hope if thou haue but one dramme of indifferencie, that thou wilteſt wipe this bleamiſh from my face. If I fall nowe into rougher tearmes impute the fault to him, that kept not himſelfe within the ſame bounds as I beganne. Moreover, it is impoſsible to anſwere this booke, wherein are ſo many errours in al kinds of learning

with.

without tearms of offence. The humour alſo of this adverſary is ſuch, and his eſtimation amongeſt the ſimple, that if I ſpare him, I ſhall feede it, and hinder the trueth. Add that it is impoſsible for me to paſſe over ſuch vnmanerly diſgraces of lies, impudēt lies, ſhameles lies in matters politicall, damnable lies in maters theological: diſagreing with Mathew, Mark, Luke, Iohn, Paul, Peter, Chriſt himſelf, & al the ſcriptures, and never turne the bale comming ſo faire to the other end of the tenniſe. In ſome places hee giueth my words a meaning, that I neuer meant: In ſome places he giues my arguments a ſhape, that I neuer made. In ſome places hee bends his proofes to things not denied: In many places hee ſlipps the point in controverſie, and paſſes by arguments, as if he neuer ſawe them. And in no place anſweres one argument like a ſcholler, much leſſe a Doctor. If I rippe vp theſe things in their places freely: I hope good Reader, that thou wilteſt rather lay the fault on him, that made them ſuch; than me, that cal them as they are. Thus beſeeching thee to weigh the cauſe throughly, and to giue every colour his own name: I leaue thee to the Lord.

Thine and all theirs that loue the Lord Ieſus.

Alexander Hume.

THE COPPY OF MASTER DOCTORS LETTER SENT to me with his booke.

GRace and peace. There was brought to me in Auguſt laſt an anſwere made to my ſermon preached at Chippenhame the 28. of February by your ſelfe, which for that I was then riding to London, I laid vp in my ſtudie till my returne. At which time examining it: I found that you had indeavored to anſwere ſome part of my ſermon: and ſome things you left vnanſwered. Hereupon I had thought to make no replie. But when I vnderſtoode, that ſpeeches were blazed abroad that neither I could, nor durſt anſwere it: I entered into a reſolution either to defend my ſelf or els to recant, to ſtay the ſpeeches of the multitude. And therefore to ſatisfie your requeſt haue made a replie, wherein I haue proued my former reaſons to be firme & vncontroleable, and your anſwer to be weak & vnſufficient: for that you diſagree with Dauid, Eſay, Ezechiel, Mathew, Peter, Paul, yea Chriſt himſelf, as it ſhal appeare in the conference. It is an eaſie matter to ſet your ſelfe againſt M. Hil. But it is not ſo eaſie a mater to ſet your ſelf againſt the Prophets, and Apoſtles, and Chriſt himſelfe. Hee vvill ſay to you as he ſaid to Paul, σκληρον σοι προς κεντρον λακτιζειν. Wherefore I pray you, if you vvill proceed in this conference to lay downe the vvhole as I do: and conſider vvhat, vvhen, and vvhere you vvrite. You write of an article of our faith, vvhich muſt be confirmed by Gods word. If therefore it ſhal

appeare

appeare, that you haue gainſaid the Apoſtles vvordes and meanings: vvho vvill beleeue you for an orthodoxall teacher? you write in the moſt perrillous times. When therefore, the Papiſts ſhall ſee your deceiptfull handling of Gods word, they vvill reioice at it. Laſtly, you vvrite againſt an opinion imbraced in the Church of England alwaies, and confirmed by our learned ſynod, and convocation in the Parliament. Therefore you muſt aſſure your ſelfe, that you cannot cary this cauſe away without weightie, & irrefragable reaſons. I receiued alſo the laſt of November, an anſwere in Latine. I vvill at ſucceſſiue houres frame by Gods grace, an anſwer to that. In the meane ſeaſon, you may peruſe this, and ſee by this replie, vvhat good ſucceſſe you may promiſe your ſelfe, and your friends in the other. Thus deſiring God to direct this conference, and al other our labours to his glorie, I end. Weſtburie at my houſe, the laſt of December. 1590.

Yours in the Lord, Adam Hill.

TO THE RIGHT WORSHIP-FVL, ADAM HIL DOCTOR OF DIVINITIE,

Vicar of Westburie, person of Goosage, Prebend and subchanter of the Cathedrall Church of our Ladie, *in the Citie of newe Sarum.*

IN May before the Moneth of Auguſt, you ſpeake of going home to viſite my naturall friends, I left my reply to your ſermon to be delivered you. But it was kept backe vppon the conſiderations, which I haue ſaide in my Epiſtle to the Reader. What other Coppy you receiued in Auguſt, I cannot tel: But wel I am aſſured I ſent you none. Howſoeuer you came by that coppy, plaine dealing wold haue anſwered that which I ſent you my ſelfe. you tell me, that going vp to London, you receiued an anſwere to your Sermon, & perving it at your returne, you found it an endeavoure to anſwere ſome peece of it: and within few lines you will me to ſet downe alas you do. Your ſimile is vnfit, for you ſet not downe all, that you had of me. Neither could I ſet down all your Sermon: for I had but the notes of it: and them alſo written with your owne hand ſo confuſedly, that it woulde haue troubled your ſelfe, to tell which was the beginning, middle, or end. Therefore this quarrell, that I did not ſet downe all, ſeeing I had not all, is very vnreaſonable. As for your notes I anſwered them all, ſauing two arguments, which being forced to ſeek heere one, and there an other, I miſſed in that confuſed Chaos of *nondum rerum, harum diſcordia ſemina rerum*. If you had bene diſpoſed to ſpeake properly, they were too ſmall a quidlet, to make all the reſt be called, but a peece of your Sermon. But your warineſſe heere is notable. Leaſt ſome might think too well of my reply: you will not vouchſafe it the name of an anſwere: but an indeavoure to anſwere ſome peece of your Sermon. Such indeavours as this, may well blind the ſimple: but amongſt the wiſe wil never purchaſe much credit to your cauſe. But you would haue let all alone you ſay, if the ſpeeches of the people diſgracing your abilitie had not ſet you a worke: my deſire was either to winne you to vs, or reaſons from you to drawe me to you. But nowe it appeareth that your owne eſtimation was more precious in your eies, than the defence of the trueth, or winning men from

from errours. This will be a foull blot in the face of a Doctor: except you wash it with a bale of truth and plaine dealing, confessing that I was in no errour at all. But then you say you resolved to defend your selfe, or else to recant. I thought you had bene resolute in Chippinhames pulpit six moneths before, if you were not as resolute then as now, I will not take your word for shoe-buckles: for I had then more witnesses to your word, than I haue now to your hand. But me thinks it is strange, that I oppugning David, Esay, Ezechiell, Peter, Paul, and Christ himself, could haue escaped the check of your pen, if it had not bene to maintaine your owne credite amongst the people. It is without doubt, that you loued that most, that moved you most. If you were not as jelous of their maintenance as your owne estimation you were not so sure a friend, as many supposed. But it is hard for me you say, to kicke against the prick. It were so if I did so. but looke you M. Doctor to your owne heeles: for my part I haue the testimony of a good conscience. No other cause, than the simple loue of the trueth set me on worke. I levelled not at preferment. I commended not my work to great persones. I published not my book till you opened the gate: & I could do no lesse than followe. As for Christ and his Apostles I hope to make it clear in al indifferent eares, that I haue not opposed one syllable against them: And that you pull my wordes, as Cacus did Hercules his Kein into what stinking dennes, it pleseth your wrangling braine to devise. I know both what, when, and where I write. I write of an Article of our faith, in which I am so much more earnest, as the Children of God shuld be more diligent to vnderstand their faith aright. As for these dangerous times it is you that neglect them. It is you, that devide the coat of Christ: it is you that handle the Scriptures guilefully: it is you, that publish private things to make the Papists sport, and trouble the Church. That which divers learned Papists affirme the Scriptures, never saide you put them to the rack to make them confesse. Scotus saith, that the discense of Christ into hell cannot be prooued by Scriptures. Andradius one of the learnest that was in the counsel of Trent, saith it, and proues it. Hesselius another of the same counsell construeth the place of Peter against you. To him accordeth Thomas Aquinas. and Dionysius Carthusianus agreeth with Andradius. It were easie to quote many: If the seeking of them were not more laborious, than their testimonies will be effectuall in this cause. I bring onely these to set their ingenuitie against your partialitie. As for the Church of England, it hath not alwaies fostered your opinion, as you vntruely avouch. The times of popery, we yeeld you: because you agree in the name, and the places be but severall roomes of one dungeon. Nei-

ther can we denie you the times of King Edward, which creeping but out of the shelles of Popery, had not shaken of the buddes of your errour, about that time the greatest part of your favorities liued: and in that time your opinion (for want of better) was confirmed by convocation. But anno 1564. in the beginning of her Majesties raigne, in a convocation assembled to reestablish the Acts of King Edward, which Queene Mary had taken away, that article only was reformed, and your opinion defaced, no more being left, but the naked article of the beleefe in wordes equivalent. wherevpon I build this reason. No counsell nor convocation censuring a former taketh that away, which it selfe alloweth. But this convocation censuring the convocation of King Edward, hath taken your opinion away. Ergo, this convocation allowed not your opinion. But contrariwise, the same Church of England hath made our opinion her owne, by publishing by her authoritie, Thomas Rogers exposition of these Articles, wherein he agrees with vs: and countenansing it with her owne name, in titeling it the English Creede. She hath also printed and allowed by her authoritie many books against you. The Geneva Bible, I know not how many times: The newe Testament with Beza and Villerius his notes: Fulkes answere to the Remishe Testament: Baro his Lectures vpon Ionas: Calvins Institutions at large, and abridged: Northbrooks Confession: Fulk against Gregory Martine, and the Rhemists: Whitaker against Campion and Duræus: Vrsinus his Catechisme: Bastingius his Catechisme: Andrewe Willets vewe of Popery, with many others: Some dedicated to the Queene her selfe, Some to my Lord Treasurer, some to my lord of Huntington, some to my lord of Leister, some to my lord of Bedford, some to my lord of Warwick, some to one, some to another, all allowed, and all against you, Lastly our opinion hath bene taught in the Pulpits, defended in Schooles, allowed in the Vniversities, so that one Doctor Husse, his grace was denied in Cambridge aboue 20. yeares agoe for your opinion: and your owne had bene denied you within this three yeares in Oxford, if you had not promised more than you meant to performe. Whatsoeuer other men hath done, or spoken for their owne: you are the first that ever I heard of, that oppugned ours in the Church of England: saving D. Husse in Leister. Against whome the Bishop of that Diocesse did oppose himselfe, procuring from Cambridge their Reader, countenanced with the authoritie of their convocation, to confute that opinion, which the englis

name

Synod. Ed. Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est, & sepultus: ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse. Nam corpus vsq; ad resurrectionẽ in sepulchro iacuit: spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus, qui in carcere, siue in inferno detinebantur fuit, illisq; predicauit quemadmodum testatur Petri locus.

Synod. Eliz. principium tantum retinuit. Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est, & sepultus: ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse.

name of hel did make more popular, and probable to the ignorant, by the countenance of that famous, and worthie Vniversitie. Thus men may see how truely you challenge the Church of England, to haue allowed your opinion alwaies: your alwaies commeth short of all that time, which you desired most to take your part: for men of your livery, if you may get autoritie on your side, count your self otherwaies sufficiently armed. As for me, If I handle the scriptures deceitfully: let not onely the Papists laugh at me: but let al Christians spit at me. if I reforme it not, when I am convicted. Howe strong my reasons are, to cary this cause cleare through the midst of the aduersaries of it: I hope the sequell will proue: and I referre it to the advised judgment of the indifferent Reader: I cannot tell how to frame irrefragable reasons to you. There was a Propheeie (as Curtius recordeth) that hee who could vndoe the knottes of Gordius his chariot, should be Emperour of Asia. Alexander intending that conquest, came to the temple where those knottes were kept, to see, if hee could open them. But they beeing insoluble by mans reason, hee tore all assunder with his sword. So you serue my arguments, be they never so irrefragable: when you cannot open them with reason: you teare them all assunder with violence. As for my latine answere, which I indeed did send you, and you in trueth should haue answered me, and not this wandring vagabound: you haue had it these three yeares and more, wherein were succeſſiue houres ynough to answere two sheets of Paper: if you haue not bin more busie about greater matters, than you would haue the world to knowe. In the meane time I haue perused this, and put my friends in hope of good succeſſe in the other: when your long leasure will serue you to answere it. Thus beseeching God to giue vs all one heart and one minde, I end.

Yours in the Lord, Alexander Hume.

THE STATE OF THIS QVESTION brieflie set down, for the capacitie of such as are not able to carie the drift of all this discourse before them.

THe hebreuue vvord SHEOL, vvhich the Greekes call hades, the latines infernus, and vve hell, hath three significations in the scriptures.

First and properlie it signifieth the graue, or common condition of all the dead, expressed in the greek hades by the priuation of light or lyfe.

Secondlie, the place of tormentes, appointed for the punishment of the vvicked: for this the hebreuue vvord is vsed, and our inglish vvorde most vsuall, or rather as it is commonlie taken, hardlie signifieth any thing els.

Thirdlie, the torments of hel, vvhich by a Metonymicall hyperbole for amplifications sake, is manie times attributed to the sorrovves of this life. These things are known to al the learned. And this D. confesseth them sect. 4. See also sect. 8. sect. 9. and sect. 14.

Nowe, vvhere our beleefe hath that Christ descended into hell: the question is vvhich of these three significations doth best fit that article of our faith. We say, that seing euery article of our faith must haue an vndouted sense confirmed by the Scriptures, it must needs signifie the hellish torments that he suffered for our redemption, or the darknesse of death, vvhich svvallowed him the three daies that he vvas in the graue. That these thinge are true, and may be the true sense of that article, our aduersaries cannot denie. Yet not contented heere vvith, they vvil sinke deeper, and send Christs soule to the damned pit of hell, neither to suffer himself, nor to helpe those that suffered there. Nowe, because this is a thing that no man can avouch vpon his ovvne knowledge, but God himself: We refuse to take their vvords vvithout his vvarrant. Wherefore to mend this crooke, they lay three texts of Scripture in the presse. The first is out of the 16. Psalme: the second is out of the 3. chap. of the 1. Pet. the last & vveakest, out of the 4. to the Ephes. But these proofes being doubtfull, that is, implying other plainer senses We denie them to be sufficient to make this doubtfull assertion, an vndoubted article of our faith. Our reason is, no doubtfull proofes can make a doubtfull assertion an vndoubted article of our faith: But these proofes be doubtfull. Ergo, these proofes cannot make this doubtfull assertion, an vndoubted article of our faith. That these proofes be doubtfull, the vvords, drifts, and circumstances, offering other sen-

ses

ſes both plainer, and better ſitting the places, and agreeable to the reſt of the Scriptures, will driue anie reaſonable head to confeſſe. Neither doeth diuerſe learned Papiſts denie it. But this aduerſaric more impudent then they, blusheth not like a vvyer drawer, to pull theſe Scriptures through narrovve holes, to make them ſmal inough, to tie our faith to his fantaſie. Moreouer, vvith like violence, hee is forced to break dovvn tvvo other vvalls that ſtands in his vvay. The one is in the 23 of Luke, *ver. 46.* Father into thy hands I commend my ſpirit. *and the other in the 43. ver of the ſame cap. ſpoken to the theef,* This day ſhalt thou be with mee in Paradice. *By vvhich tvvo places it is cleare, that Chriſts ſoule vvas then in heauen, and not in Hell. Vpon the true ſenſe of theſe places riſeth this diſputation, to vvhich I referre the diſcreet and indifferent Reader, beſeeching them to read vvith a ſingle eie, and iudge vvith an vpright hart. Onelie I vvill lance an impoſtume of abſurdities, vvhich breeding in the bovvels of this opinion, like the vvorme that breeds in the nut, hath putrified all the probabilitie of it, and made all men of indifferent iudgement in this age to caſte it vnder the boord amongeſt the sheeddes.*

Firſt, that Chriſt went down to Hell to triumph, contrarie to the nature of Hell, which yeeldeth nothing but horrour and torments. And contrarie to the nature of a triumph, which was vſuallie ſolemnized amongſt them, to whom the joy of the victorie did appertaine

Secondlie, that Chriſts ſoule did preach in Hell, contratie to the nature of a ſoule, that cannot preache: and the condition of theſe hearers, who could reap no profite of his ſermon, having their jugement alreadie.

Thirdlie, that he did preach neither to convert the hearers, nor to condempne them for the contempt of his word: but to aggraiuate their ſorrowes. Contrarie to the office of Chriſt, which was to offer mercie to all his hearers.

Fourthlie, that Chriſts ſoul did preach in Hel realliе, not vocallie: that is, did preach in Hel and ſay nothing: contrary to the nature of the word preach, which neuer man did, without voice & words.

Fifthlie, that Chriſt meaning to go to Hell, (as they ſay) did notwithſtanding commend his ſoule into the hands of God. Contrarie to the true and common vſe of theſe words vſed by Stephan, Act. 7. and all other godlie men, that crave to be in heauen.

Sixthlie, that his ſoule was in Hell without torments, contrarie to the name and nature of Hell, which preſenteth to the eare and hart, nothing but hainous and hideous torments.

Seuenthlie, that in theſe words (Thou ſhalt be with mee in Paradice) Chriſt ſpake onelie of his God-head. Contrarie to the nature of the pronoune (*me*) which doeth alwaies note the whole perſon that ſpeaketh.

Eight

Eightlie, that having conquered Hell vpon the croſſe: It was needfull for him notwithſtanding to goe to hell. Contrarie to the ſufficiencie of Chriſts ſacrifice, who had paid a full ranſome for our ſinnes before, and left nothing behinde to be done in Hell. Theſe 8. cankers are feſtered in the marrowe of this abſurde opinion, for all which, all the Scriptures hath not one ſillable, and therefore it muſt be a monſter, that hath bred ſo manie monſters.



I Had anſwered Maiſter Doctors Sermon (as he calls it) but to avoid prolixitie, and becauſe this is but a repetition of his reaſons there, I haue left it out, and haue ſent him a breefe ſumme thereof, to ſhewe him that there is nothing there, better then here: only in the end of it, he calles al his adverſaries Boyes, ſchiſmaticks, phantaſticall ſpirits, raſhe without ſtudie, and preſumptuous without feare of God. If *Caluin* be a boy, if *Beza* be a boy, if *Marlarot* be a boy, if *Vrſinus* be a boy, if *Baſtingius* be a boy, if *Ramus* be a boy, if *Olevian* be a boy, if *Iunius* be a boy, if *Tremelius* be a boy, if *Baro* be a boy, if *Brenſius* be a boy, if *Hereſbathius* be a boy, if *Sohnius* be a boy, if *Bullinger* be a boy, if *Bucer* be a boy, if *Daneus* be a boy, if *Sadel* be a boy, if *Viret* be a boy, if *Sarcerius* be a boy, if *Swinglius* be a boy, if *Dering* be a boy, if *Perkins* be a boy, if *Rogers* be a boy, if *Fulk* be a boy, if *Willet* be a boy, if *Reynolds* be a boy, if *Whitaker* be a boy if *Hoper* biſhop of Gloceſter be a boy, if *Reynald Peacock*, Biſhop of Cheſter in the time of *Henrie* the ſixt be a boy: I wil ſtand to it, that this D. is not worthie to wait on many boyes, and bear their bookes to the Schoole, of their diligence, of their learning, of their diſcretion, of their integritie, of their conſtãcie, of their humilitie, though his mouth runne over in generall, I hope he will bluſh to touch any of them in particular. This I haue ſet downe to ſhewe thee gentle Reader, that his cauſe wants not more & greater adverſaries, then he ſuppoſeth it to haue fauorers.

THE

THE FIRST SECTION OF HVME *his Letter.*

IT fell out vpon ſome occaſions, that I was with a freend not farre frō *Chippenham*, the day before you preached there. As I was preparing to depart, word came to my friend that you had certified *M. Chalſont* of your intent the day following, to defende that which hee had ſpoken againſt *M. Wiſedome*, that day ſennight be fore, concerning the deſcenſion of Chriſt into hell: where fore my friend wrought me to ſtay, to heare what could be ſayd for a matter, that both hee and I did thinke to haue no great probabilitie. I did ſo, and it repenteth me not, for there I heard ſomething, which otherwiſe perhaps would neuer haue entered in my barren brain. & I was ſtrengthned in the truth, prouing that which is cōmonly ſaid, that wit & eloquence is not able to ſhake it. Wherfore, I haue thoght it not amis to write theſe few lines vnto you, either to win you to vs, or to win ſome better reaſon frō you, to bring me to you. I am not maryed to mine owne opinion, but if any man can bring mee better proofe, I am content to yeeld. I hope the ſame of you, for you told mee ſo in the pulpit, where the tong ſhould wait vpon the hart, and ſpeake his affections: & it is the dutye of all men, eſpecially of miniſters, to imploy their laboures to knowe the truth, and not contentiouſly to defend their owne conceits, which many tymes deceiues e-

uen the wiſeſt. As yet your reaſons haue confirmed rather then converted me.

HILL, his reply.

IN the entrance of your anſwer, you haue told two vntruths vpon vntrue reports. The on, that I certified M. Chalfont of mine intent, which is not ſo: for neither by meſſenger nor letter, did I euer ſend to M. Chalfont. The other is, where you auouch that I would make an apology of. M. Chalfonits ſayings againſt M. Wiſdome, which God knoweth was neuer my meaning: for firſt, I neuer knew what he had ſayd in that controuerſy, til the morning I preached. Secondly, I did alwaies loue and honour M. Wiſedome, but M. Chalfont, til that morning I was not acquainted with al. Thirdly, hearing a ſtrife reuiued of that matter, which was not long before quieted in Sarum by the laſt Biſhop, now Archbiſhop of Yorke, and being requeſted to deliuer my iudgment in the matter, not by M. Chalfont, but by one Richarde Woodlands, to ſet vnity betwixt my bretheren, and not to warre againſt M. Wiſedome: In the feare of God, and not to pleaſe you or your friend, or any other man, I layd downe my iudgement, and gaue vp my Sermon in writing to M. Wiſedome, crauing an anſwere to the whole, & not to ſome part of it. Now, you haue made an anſwer to ſome, how truly it ſhall appeare: and other things you haue left vnanſwered, for what cauſe, let the reader iudge. In the end, you charge me with wit, which is ſmall, with eloquence, which is none, and with my promiſe, whith I will keepe moſt willinglie, hoping that you will keepe youres.

THeſe hainous accuſations of vntruthes might haue beene left; ſaving that you would haue the worlde to thinke that I am a common lyar. To this end you crie out almoſt in euerie ſect. impudent and monſtrous lyes. It is in deed, a point of Rhethorike, but you neuer learned it in Chriſts ſchoole, to build the credite of your cauſe (if it be euill) on the diſcredite of your aduerſarie. But they which are acquainted with my life, I hope wil juſtifie me of this crime: and they that know mee not, neede no better argument of my innocencie, then your accuſations, and the ſmall occaſions, that you take againſt mee. For, if the report that came to my friend, was not true, I hope it was no great fault of mine: nor greater fault in you, to haue certified *M. Chalfont* of your purpoſe, then to haue performed it. If I woulde ſit downe to *audite*, and take counters in hand to lay your ſlippes, but halfe ſo diligentlie, as you are buſie vpon euery corner of occaſions, to pul my wordes into ſuſpition of vntruthes: I coulde note in this præface foure ſcapes, not miſtaken vpon vntrue reportes (as you charge mee) but miſreported by your ſelf, that wold ſcarſe abide a juſt tryall of honeſt dealing. Firſt, that hearing ouer night of that controverſie ſo much in mens mouthes, you knewe not *M. Chalfonts* part till the morning, you preached there; may be true, but is not verie likelie. Secondlie, that you ment not to defend *M. Chalfonts* opinion, will hardlie be beleeued, except you can perſwade the audience, that you ment one thing, and did an other. Thirdlie, that you gaue vp your ſermon to *M. Wiſedome* in writing. *M. Wiſedome* can tel that it is not true. Hee had nothing of you, but a few ſcribled & diſordered notes. The laſt is cunninger, that I anſwered not the whole, but ſome part of your ſermon. That which eſcaped without anſwere, was ſo ſmall a part, that the reſt might well

haue bene called the whole, if you had not bene diſpoſed to abuſe the ſimplicitie of your reader. That the matter then in controverſie was ſtaied before in Sarum by the Biſhop, was true: but in ſuch ſort, that if you had not bene more buſie, then your commiſsion: it might haue ſtand more with your credite, to haue let *Chippenham* alone. For you were there injoined by the Biſh. & two Iuſtices of the peace, to confeſſe that *M. Connam* his opinion (who was then your adverſary) was *pia & vera ſententia*. Whether you came to make peace amongſt your brethren, and not to warre againſt *M. Wiſedome*, I referre it to the audience: peace-makers vſe not to take parts. Your peace did ſo little pleaſe *M. Wiſdome* (for as much as you honor him) that beeing denied the pulpit at *Chippenham*, by *Chalfont*, contrarie to the order, he was driuen to take Cotham church, not far diſtant, to defend the truth againſt you, and your mate, which thing he performed with great meekeneſſe and humilitie after his maner, to the comforte of all that heard him, & the ædifying of them, that were deſirous to know the trueth. Theſe things, if I were diſpoſed to go to Tennis with you, would ſound more lie-like, then all the lies, you haue flung at me. But you are a Doctor, and that were vn-manerlie. Yet (ſaving your worſhip) you keepe not ſo good a watche through this worke, as it becums ſuch a lie-catcher. Wherefore to conclude: where you ſay, that I accuſe you of wit, & eloquence: onelie denie the action, and I will let fall my ſute. But as for your promiſe, I will neuer let goe my holde, becauſe I hope you will proue a man of your word.

A true and godly opinion.

HVME *his* 2. *Sect.*

NOwe to come to the matter, I ſee no cauſe why you ſhould thinke better of *Auguſtine* and *Ie-*

rome, then of *Caluin* and *Beza*, for they were all but men, and they which now are olde, were sometimes new. They had no better warrant of Gods spirit then these: and errors in those dayes were so thicke sowen, that there grewe darnell in the best fieldes, euen of them whome now we most admire. I speake not this to descredit the Fathers, but to proue that they were no Gods. They were no dout, his good instruments, to maintaine his truth against his enemies, but they wer but mẽ: you can not denie, but the best of them had his steynes. This no doubt, was the forepurposed worke of gods infinite wisdom, that seeing these infirmities, our fond age might not set their writings in the place of his eternall word, wherof one iote shal not passe, though heauen and earth perish.

HILL *his reply.*

The Paralogismes in the D. reply.

1. THo argumentes you make 2 against Augustine and Ierome. The one is, they had errors, 3 and therfore their interpretation not to be admitted. The other is, the time wherein they lined was corrupt, and for 4 that cause they are not to be alledged in a controuersy of Diuinitie. The same 5 argument, I make against all new writers. 6 All new writers haue errors, and they liue in a most corrupt time, wherein (as Christ saith) shall bee many fals prophets, & many fals Christs, to deceiue the very elect if it were posible, Math. 24. 24. 7 Therfore, because men are vaine, & the time corrupt, wee must beleue no man. 8 You argue *ab accidente ad subiectũ* 9 For Augustine & Ierome to erre, it is an accident, 10 but the substance of all Fathers is, 11 to beget men in the word of truth, 1. Cor. 4. 15. And so: this

1. My argumẽts be twise two, if you rekon right.
2. But not one against Aug. nor Ierome.
3. 4. These cõclusions you neuer founde in my papers.
5. make what you will, my argument is not against new nor olde.
6. This argument is not lyke mine.
7. This conclusion wil not follow in any forme.
8. The fallacie of your argument is not *ab accidente*, but *à non causa pro causa*.
9. This is wrong collected: the reason is not from error to Augustine & Ierome.
10. To be a Father, is an accident in it self, and hath no substance
11. This is not the substance, but the proper fact of Fathers

this cause, Augustine himselfe willeth vs not to beleeue him, vnlesse hee bring the word of God. Truly (sayth Augustine) 12 I do desire not onlie a godlie reader, but a free corrector in all my writings, especially, in those things where there is great doubt: 13 but as I will not haue him to be giuen vnto mee, so, I will not haue him to be giuen to himselfe: let him not loue mee more then the Catholike faith. As I say to him, beleue not my sayings as Canonical scriptures, but beleue stedfastly, whē thou hast found that which thou beleuedst not, but beleue not firmly, that which thou hast not seene out of Gods worde. So I say to him, do not correct my writings by thine owne opinion, or of contention, but by the word of God, & by the reason therof vncontrouleable. 14 And against Cresconius the Grammarian hee thus writeth, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 32. Iam not moued with the authority of this Epistle. but I consider thē out of the Canonical books, and if they agree with the worde of God, I receiue them with prayse, if they disagree, I refuse them with peace. The like he hath *Epist.* 3. & *Epist.* 112. 15 And Ierome *ad Theoph.* is of the same iudgment. I know that I esteeme otherwise the Apostles, and otherwise other interpreters: these men speak truth alwayes, these men in some things do erre somtime. 16 These Fathers themselues, confes themselues to be but mē, & wil vs to beleeue thē no farther thē they agree with Gods word. 17 Therfore, they building vpō Christ, aswell as your newe, ought to be beleeued rather in this point then they: 18 For what they wrote in this controuersy, the same did all other godly Interpreters both Greek and Latin, hauing a good warrant from Gods word. 19 But those of your side, write contrary to Gods word, to the auncient Fathers, yea and contrarie to the new Fathers, namly, Luther, Seleuccer, Chytræus, Pomeran, Aepinus, Lucas, Lossius, Ale-

12. That is it that I woulde haue.

13.14.15. thes places would help mee well if need requyred. If my cause had wāted proofe, I would haue bestowed a fee on you.

16. Then this makes for me, that they wer but men.

17. I see no reson in that.

18.19.20. In these three places you beg the question.

Alesius, Aretius, Peter Martyr, M. Fox, and M. Nowel.
20 Therefore, because Augustine and Ierome agree both with the old and new writers, & especially, with the worde of God, I like better of them; teaching the affirmatiue, then of any other 21 labouring to proue the negatiue. To end 22 therefore, you must note this, that all sayings of the Fathers, either they are demonstratiue out of the scriptures, & then they are the voyce of God: or else probable, and these are the voyce of man, or else false, and then they are the voice of the Serpent.

21. We holde the affirmatiue, that hee descended in to hell, as well as you.

22. This ende is impertinēt to this bodie. If it were not

to shew the reader, how finely you can distinguish the voice of the Fathers. But seing in their voice, is so much drosse: bring me I pray you, no voice but Gods, wherin is nothing but pure mettall.

HVME *his reioynder to the 2. sect.*

YOu make my argnments as pleaseth you. If wee had no better then you would affoorde vs, wee were vnworthie of credite, and worthie of your reproches. First, you alter the conclusion. I neuer thoght, said, or wrote, that their interpretations are nor to bee admitted, nor their sayings alledged in a controversie of Divinity. Neither write I against thē, except it be a discredite to them, that other men bee thought off, aswell as they. My conclusion was, that their names broght no more credite to your cause, then *Calvine* & *Beza* did bring ours. My arguments were twise so manie, as you make them. 1. That they were all but men. 2. That they who now are old, were sometimes new. 3. That they had no better warrant of Gods Spirit. 4. That errors grew as thicke in their times as in ours. Seeing then all men are fraile, and old errours are as bad as newe, and newe truthes as good as olde: seeing the spirit of truth was then no stronger, nor the spirit of error weaker: all things in this comparison you see are æquall, and my argumēt holdes

holdes for anie thing that you haue ſaid. You take the bit in your teeth, and runne out of the way with an argument *ab accidente*. Therefore, fare-you-well; that is not my way. You cite *Auguſtine* and *Ierome* onelie, to make vp nomber. Their confeſsion of their owne frailtie, is againſt you. If my arguments had not beene ſo true before, that no witneſſes can make them truer, this would haue helpt mee well. Men may ſee, that you haue either a meruelous ill cauſe, or great ſtoare of ſmall judgement, that can take ſo much paines to bring witnes into the courte, to condemne your ſelfe. And heere nowe, ſeeing your owne men do counſell mee to truſt no man without the worde: I conjure you to trouble mee no more with your great muſters, of *Luther*, *Selneccer*, *Chytreus*, *Pomeranus*, &c. If I would run that courſe, we ſhould ſet al the learned of the world together by the eares, You will beare mee down (I confeſſe) with nomber. For all the Monkes, Friars, Ieſuites, Abbotts, Biſhops, Cardinals and Popes, woulde ſwaie to your ſide. If I were not ſure of God and his truth, I would neuer draw ſword, nor giue ſtroake in the cauſe.

HVME *ſect.* 3.

THeir weaknes is no where more apparant, then in this mater that we haue now in hand: for *Ierom* ioineth his opinio herein, with a palpable error, that Chriſt deſcended to deliuer the Fathers, which to that day had bin in priſon. *Auguſtine* is not far behinde him, who though hee confeſſeth that the Fathers were in ioy with *Abraham* & *Lazarus*, yet after ſome long diſputation, whether he did deliver all or ſome, & why theſe more then thoſe; at length he concludeth, that hee did deliuer whome hee him ſelfe thought good. For, after that they had once conceaued

Ier. 4. Epheſ.

Auguſt ad Clodium.

ved that his soule descended into a locall hell. There followed (which could not choose) many inconueniences. There was non of them dreamed that which you avouch, that hee descended into hell, there to triumph or bind the divels, or to augment their sorrows, by shewing them from what grace they had fallen.

HILL *his reply.*

You write, that Ierome and Augustine did hold a palpable erroꝛ, that is, that Chꝛist descended to deliuer the Fathers. I hope you will not deny, 23 but the fathers haue their deliuerance by Chꝛist from hell 24 Therfoꝛe by the merits and woꝛks of Chꝛist, who I am sure conquered both deth and hell. Therefoꝛe where you pꝛoue that Augustine and Ierome do erre, I will leaue them as I saide befoꝛe, but where in they spake the truth, I will pꝛayse God foꝛ them. 25 But let vs see howe many wayes the scripture may be coꝛrupted, that is, by adding, altering, & diminishing. Eue in the third Chap. of Genesis taught all her childꝛen so to doe: foꝛ in the 3. verse thus shee saith, But of the fruit of the tree, which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shal not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, least ye dye. First, she changeth the woꝛd of God, foꝛ God sayth, Gen. 2. 17. of the tree of knowledge of good and euill, thou shalt not eate. Those woꝛds (of the tree of knowledge of good and euill) she changeth, & putteth in foꝛ them (in the midst of the garden.) Farther God said, they should not eat of it, shee added (that they might not touch it.) God said they should surely dye, Eue said (least wee dye) heere she diminished the scriptures. If then the Fathers haue added to the scriptures, that the Fathers were set out of hell, there I leaue them, 26 and if you change hell in to graue, as you do in the 16. psal, and

The paralogismes of this sect

23. But I will denie, and so will you, that he wer to hell to deliuer the

24. This is not the question.

25. *Nae ey yor.* This is shuffled on heere, as Tailers vsed haire in olde time to stuffe hoses.

26. We may as wel say, that you change graue into hel Do not you confesse in the next sect. that the originall doth signifie the one, as well as the other? is this changing? Fie D. deale honestlie.

and Act. 2. I will leaue you also: [b] for I stand not vpon mens sayings, but vpon the word of God. 27 But where you boldly affirme, that not 28 one of the Fathers haue deemed that 29 which I say, you shewe your self, either to bee 30 malicious in hiding the truth, or else so ignorant, that you haue not read the Fathers: for diuers, both old & new are of my iudgement. 31 Ambrose on the fourth Chapter of the Ephesians, thus writeth. Christ therefore comming downe from heauen into the earth, was borne a man, afterward he died, and descended into 32 Hell, from whence rising the third day, he shewed death vanquished to every creature. 33 Augustine *de tempore*, In his 137. sermon, and in his third sermon of the resurrection thus sayeth: Hell did restore him as a conquerour, and the heauens did receaue him as a triumpher. And in his second sermon, hee saieth thus: Behold, you haue hard what our defender, the God of vengeance is said to haue done freely. For after he was exalted, that is, was hanged of the Iewes on the crosse, that I may touche these thinges briefly, assoone as hee had giuen vp the ghost, the soule vnited to the Diuinitie, descended into the bottom of hel: and when he had touched the band of darkenesse, as a fearefull & glorious spoyler, the wicked & hellish Legions were affrayde, & trembling, began to enquire, saying, Who is this dreadful & glorious man? Eusebius writing of the resurrection of our sauiour, hath the like: We must know, that in the selfe same houre wherein our Sauiour bowing his head gaue vp the ghost, his body being left in the graue, his soul with the Diuinitie went downe to triumph ouer Hell. 34 Fulgentius writing to King Thrasymund, in his third booke

b hold there M.D. remember that hereafter I shall finde time to put you in minde of this againe

27. You mistake mee blindlie, read againe.

28. I spake onlie of Aug. & Ier. read again

29. Though I might stand to this, becaus they send Christ to hell, wherein the Fathers were detained, and you to the place of the damned, yet this is not the thing that I said. I onelie said neither August. not Ierome, did send Christ to hell on your erand, to triumph ther and cut-face those miserable wretches.

30. This malice and your heare grew

both in one grou̅d. 31. Heer Ambrose saith not that which I deny. 32. Let hel be heer taken for the condition of death, and this place may haue a favorable construction 33. This place of Augustine saieth it not. 34. This place of Fulgentius saith it not.

booke and eight Chapter, not dreaming, but wel aduiſed, thus writeth: The true humanitie of the ſonne of God, neyther was wholye in the graue, nor wholie in hell, but in the Sepulcher, hee lay dead, according to his true fleſhe, but in his Soule deſcended into Hell. In his ſoule hee returned to the fleſh which lay in the Sepulcher, but in reſpect of the Diuinitie, which neither is holden in place, nor limited by bond, he was wholy in the graue with his fleſh, and wholy with his Soule in hel, and by this meanes was fully enery where Chriſt, becauſe God was not ſeperated from the humanitie which he had aſſumpted, which was both with his Soule in Hell; that from Hel, his Soule might returne a Conquereſſe, and was with his fleſhe, that by reaſon of his ſpeedie reſurrection, it might not be corrupted. I haue heere alleaged the old, which diſproue your aſſertion, for all theſe accord with mee. Now, to theſe will I adde alſo the iudgements of ſome new Writers. 35 Mollerus a very learned Miniſter of Germany on the 16. Pſalme thus teacheth: Chriſt would ſhew his victorie in a certain ſort ouer the Diuells, to ſtrike perpetuall terrors in to them, and to take away from vs the feare of their tyrānie. To this agreeth Muſculus on the fiftie and eight Pſalme. This G O D, which was in Chriſt, reconciling the world to himſelfe, firſt deſcended into the 36 loweſt partes of the earth, then hee led captiuitie captiue; and not onely wee are deliuered from the captiuitie of Satan, ſinne, and damnation, but alſo triumphing ouer them as Tyrants, he hath aſcended aboue all heauens, to fulfill all things. The ſame learned Fathers, interpreting the ſecond Chapter of the Coloſsians, thus hath: There are ſome that bee perſwaded it is an abſurditie, if it be ſayd, that Chriſt did triumph ouer the principalities and powers, but if all theſe things be attributed to God the Father,

35. If you haue no more in Mollerus for you then this, he is neither for your hell, nor your triumph.

36. Before you hewe this block to fit your hand, you muſt firſt perſwade vs, that the lowermoſt partes of the earth, can be nothing els but hell.

that he did them with Chriſt, and in Chriſt, wee may truly reade heere, triumphing ouer them 37 in his owne perſon. In like ſort, doth Hemingius expound this place in the ſecond Chapter of the Coloſsians: As by his death he conflicted with the Diuell on the Croſſe, ſo by his glorious deſcending into Hell, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion, he triumphed, as it is Eph. 4. leauing his Croſſe lift vp as a monument of his victorie. So doth M. Fox 38 vnderſtād this place, in a booke which he hath written, entituled, *Chriſtus triumphans*. Therefore in this behalfe, you haue tolde a manifeſt 39 vntruth; wherfore, I thinke you will ſcarce haue care to ſet forth the truth of God, when you will preſumptuouſly vtter ſuch an vntruth, which may be reproued, by ſo many honorable witneſſes. Farther, here you leaue out at your pleaſure, two other endes of Chriſt deſcēding into Hel, which I taught in my Sermon: the one is, 40 the manifeſtation of his death, the other is, our 41 deliuerance from Hell. Playne dealing ought to be in this caſe, and therefore, I expect it at your hands.

37. What will you gaine, & that begrāted

38. M. Foxe hath nothing in all that worke to help you: but onlie the ſame picture in the beginning of his booke, which your printer hath ſet before yours. Therefore you ſhoulde quote the printer, you do M. Foxe wrong.

39. You charg me vntruelie with vntruths therefore take ye the pig that bred the pig.

40. ἀναχολύθον the deſcending into Hell, cannot manifeſt his death. *Obſcurius non illuſtrat obſcurum.*

41. That he did by his death, not by his deſcending into hell.

Hvme *his reyonder.*

IF I will let you alone, you will neuer afforde mee a good argument; I ſee, I muſt needes frame them my ſelf. *Auguſtine* and *Ierome* erring, are not to bee præferred to *Calvine* and *Beza* teaching a trueth. But *Auguſtine* and *Ierome* doe erre in this controverſie: *Ergo*, in this controuerſie, they are not to be præferred to *Calvine* and *Beza*. That *Calvine* and *Beza* doth teach in this point the truth, you can not denie. You will

will say (perhapps) that it is not the true meaning of the article. That is the question. But I hope you will not deny, but the thing it selfis true. Now *Augustine* and *Ierome*, do erre in the very thing it selfe. Heere you fumble about an excuse, and would faine say something. But you had better say nothing, then so little to the purpose. You thinke that no man will denie, but that the fathers had their deliuerie from Hell by Christ, so thinke I too. But what helps that, these mens errour? The one held, that Christ went to Hell to delyuer the Fathers: the other, to deliuer whome he himselfe thought good. Will your rotten Vernish, hyde this blemish? You tell me in the next sect. that it doeth little or nothing pertaine to this question. The question is about the descending of Christ into hell: and this they make the finall end of that action. Nowe, if you can proue, that the finall end hath no pertinãce to the thing destinated to it, though it bee but a question of arte, I will acknowledge you to bee a better D. then you proued your selfin Oxon. and a better artist, then euer I suspected you to bee: though I was reasonablie well perswaded of your skill, before you shamed your selfe. And yet I would haue you to marke (if you can spare so much time, as to marke anie thing against your selfe) that this is a very materiall point in this question. For this final end, doth separate these mens opinion, and yours. They send Christ to hell to deliuer the Fathers, and you send him to the hell of the damned, where the Fathers neuer were. They are so farre from you, that *Ierome* saieth, it is *impium dicere Christum descendisse ad inferos, & locum damnatorum.* You spend the moste of this section, to proue mee a liar: If you could, you might discredite mee, but not the cause. But I will crack this nut on yonr owne crowne;

Epist. ad Aglasiam quest. 1. tom. 3. Epist. It is a wicked thing to say, that Christ descended into hell, or place of the damned.

crowne. Frſt, I ſaid not, that none of the Fathers denied that which you ſay. I onlie ſaide, that neither *Auguſtine* nor *Ierome*, did ſend Chriſt to hell to triumph. Secondly, if I had ſaid ſo, I had ſaid trulie. For you ſend Chriſt to the hell of the damned, and that, none of them euer deemed. Therfore in this behalf, (to vſe your owne words) you haue tolde a manifeſt vntruth of mee. You father that on mee, which I neuer ſaide: and accuſe mee for ſaying that, which I might well avouche. And heere I muſt put you in minde, that if you will joyne with all, or the moſt of them that you call forth, to take your parte in this quarrell: you muſt hyre workemen to repaire the ruinous walles of *Limbus patrum*, that you haue ſhaken ſo ſore, and ſhiuered your ſelf heer-to-fore; with the mightie ſhot of Gods æternall word.

HVME *ſect.* 4.

VVHo ſo will ſee howe vncertaine *Auguſtine* was in this point, let him reade his 99. Epiſtle to *Evodius*. There ſhal he finde manie doubtes, and almoſt nothing affirmed for certaintie: but onlie, that hee doubted not that Chriſt went to hell: building on the words of Dauid, cited by *Peter*, Act. 2. *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in hell*, &c. Where I cannot chuſe, but muſe, what ſhould moue ſo worthie a wit, and ſuch followers of him: ſeeing it is apparant in the ſcripture, that the original word doth ſignify as well the panges, as the place of hell: to paſſe by that ſignification, which the whole church of Chriſt confeſſeth to be true: and fall vpon that, which hauing ſo weake proof, had ſo great ſtraites, as *Auguſtines* deepe wit could not vnfolde. Who ſo will ſee the name of hell vſed in the Scriptures, for the ſorrowes of Hell, let him reade that of 1. *Samuel*, 2. 6.

The

The Lord killeth and maketh alive, he casteth downe to hell and bringeth vp againe: or that of Dauid, Psal. 30. 3. *Thou hast brought my soule out of Hell.* Or that of Ionas, 2. 2. *I haue called to thee out of the bottom of Hell*. And manie such like places, where that word cannot signifie the pit of Hell, whence there is no redemption: but the hellish sorrowes, which those Saints of God did suffer in this life. Now seing this is so, I wold fain knowe of you good M. *Hill*, why wee may not more safelie, take the name of Hel in that sense, which you cannot denie, then you in that, which the better part of Christians take to bee false. For that Christ descended into the pit of the damned, the best proof it hath is builded on a word of double signification, which standeth at the courtesie of the reader, to take it, as to him shall seeme most probable.

HILL *his reply.*

The Paralogismes in the D. reply.

Heere you confesse that Augustine doubteth, and yet 42 you say, that in the mater in controuersie between you and mee, he doubteth not: but proueth it by the Apostolicall and Prophetical testimonies: 43 For he willeth vs to hold it *firmissima fide*, with a most firme faith, a faith that none but an Infidel will deny it. He doubteth whether the Fathers were in Hell, or whether they were conuerted in hell by Christs preaching, as some did affirme vntrulie, and manie such like things, little or 44 nothing apperteining to the question wee haue in hand. 45 But *ad Dardanum* he doubteth not. Fol. 3. col. 272. Fol. 10. col. 1410. Fol. 3. col. 213. & 702. Fol. 6. 788. Fol. 10. 899. 989. In all these places and in manie other, he telleth without doubting, 46 that he descended in-

42 I say that your tale and his ar not one He meaneth a place where the Fathers wer detained till Christes comming.

You meane the place of the damned, where the fathers neuer were.

43. His owne not yours.

44. Doth the final end pertaine nothing, to that which worketh for it? this is new logick.

45 Doubteth he not, but that the Fathers were in hel.

46. No more doth he in the place cited by me.

to Hell, and the end why. To strike a terror into the Diuels, and to triumph ouer them. 47 It pleases you, to make your self merry with S. Augustines infirmity, I pray God you will with Sainte Augustine acknowledge your owne, 48 which by and by shall be laide before you. You wonder at S. Augustine, but we wonder at your a teachers and you: for you confesse S. Augustine to 49 build vpon Dauid and Peter, & yet you labour to ouerthrow this building, how deceatfullie, it shall now appeare. You say, that Hel signifieth the sorrowes of Hel, sometime I grant it doth. Hereupon you make this argument: 50 Sometime it signifieth the sorrowes of Hell, therefore it doth so in the 16. Psalme. 51 I denie your argument, and that you haue spoken an vntruth, the holie Ghost by Peters mouth, shalbe a witnes against you. 52 For you say, it is spoken of the sorrowes which Christ suffered vpon the Crosse, Peter saith, 53 it is spoken of the resurrection: and in the resurrection, I am sure Christ suffered no torments or sorrowes. Peters interpretation is thus, Act. 2. 32. Hee knowing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soule 54 should not be left in Hell, neither his flesh to see corruption. 55. Nowe then, heere is an answer to your demaund: these wordes are spoken of the resurrection, a matter of ioy and not of torments, for Dauid saith in the persone of Christ, Therefore did my hart reioyce, and my tong was glad: & moreouer also, my flesh shal rest in hope. If Christ 56 at this time did reioyce, how was he sorrowfull? if we were glad, how was he tormēted? if he did rest in hope, how was it true also that he was afflicted with torments? & heere you vtter another vn-

47. You dream of mirth: whē saw ye me laugh at that sport.

48. When you haue laid that before mee: You shall see how honestly I wil demaine my self.

a In your written copy, it is M. Caluin and mee: why you haue turned it, I remit to the reader.

49. As he that builded a wal of sand, on a sure rocke.

50. This was not my argument.

51. I cannot blame you.

52. Peter and I speak not of one thing, se the answere.

53. Peter saith not, that the hel wherin he was is spoken of the resurrection.

54. That his soule was not left in hell (sayeth Peter) is spoken of his resurrection. 55 Foolishe D. howe oft must I tell you: that his being in hell, is not spoken of his resurrection. 56 He was glad of his resurrection, not of his discending into hell.

vntruth, that Christ did suffer his 57 whole tor-
ments on the Crosse, which is 58 most vntrue: for
he suffered 59 some in the Garden, when he sayde,
Math. 26. 38. My soule is heavye vnto death. And
some in Caiphas house, and some vnder Pilate: but all
his torments and sorrowes were ended on the Crosse
60 which I think, you would haue said. Last of al,
the wordes of the text that commeth after, aswell as
the wordes going before do proue, that it cannot be
spoken of Christs sorrowes, for they are these. Thou
shalt shew mee the path of life, in thy presence is the
fulnes of ioy, and at thy right hand are pleasures for
euermore. Seith then Dauid both before & after ma-
keth mention of ioy and pleasures for euermore, and
as Peter saith, these wordes proue the resurrection of
Christ: 61 I marualle how you dare to contradict
the meaning of the holy ghoste. You speake not now
contrary to Augustine, or Ambrose, or Hill, but con-
trary to Dauid and Peter themselues: you 62 boast
your selues to be the best Christians, but I can hard-
ly beeleue you are better Christians then 63 Dauid
and Peter. In the conclusion you utter 64 blaspheme,
for SHEOL being taken sometime for the sorrows
of hell, and sometime for the place of hell; you say it
standeth at the curtesie of the reader, to take it as to
him shall seeme probable. Are Gods wordes to bee
interpreted after our 65 pleasure? 66 Hillary was
of a better minde: he saide, as God was the author of
the Scriptures, so God must be the 67 interpreter:
he opened the wits of the Desciples going to Emaus,
so let vs pray, that he may open our wittes that wee
may perfectlye vnderstand the Scriptures.

57. Read a-
gaine, I saide
not so. I saide
that he suffe-
red the whole
torments of
hell on the
crosse. Of all
his tormentes
I spake not.
58. It is inded
as you tak the
name of the
crosse, and
you made it.
59. You fight
with your
owne shadow.
60. I said what
I said, and not
what you
thought.
61. Now lay
on lode. you
haue got the
victorie.
62. Or els you
do faine, look
on my latine
D. and blush
for shame.
63. was dauid
a Christian?
64. Can you
say no worse.
65. Said I so?
Is it all one to
take a text, as
it seemeth
most proba.
ble, and to tak
it after our pleasure. when will you deale plainelie. 66. This place might haue
bene spared, for anie thing that I haue saide. 67. I am of the same minde. Heerein
Hillaries minde is no better then mine.

HVME *his reioynder to the 4. sect.*

I said and say againe, that *Augustines* saying in some sort, that which you say, did runne into so manie doubtes, that he could not tell what to say. But that he doubted not in the matter between you and me, you take it before it is granted. For if I take him right (and it will passe your skill to proue that I take him wrong) he and you, are two. For *Augustine* holdeth that hee went to a Hell, whence hee was to redeeme some: and you hold that he went to the Hell of the damned, whence he was to redeeme none. If this his opinion, be to be hold *firmissima fide*: or that none but infidels will doubt of it: *Adame Hill*, will either proue another man, then men do thinke him, or as very an infidell, as they that denie it. Whether the things that he doubteth of, doth pertain to this question, I haue shewed in the former section: You wonder, seing *Augustine* doeth builde on *Dauid* and *Peter*: that my Maisters (that is *Calvine* and *Beza* in your written copie) and I doe labour to ouerthrow that building: The Papistes do build their reall presence vpon Christs words, *This is my bodie:* And must all men wonder, that hath heard the Vicar of *Westburie*, confute it? Men may set straw and stubble on a good foundation, which by fire may be consumed, and the rock not the worse, that it stood vpon. After these velitations, you come to the matter, and grant mee that which I craue, and you cannot denie: that the name of Hell is vsed in the scriptures for the paines and pangs of Hell. Whereupon you forme my argument, without forme, and denie it when you haue done. I will neuer blame your wit, for denying your owne arguments. But denie this argument, & I will say, that no wall of reason is able to stand a-

gainst

gainſt the violence of your negatiues. If the name of SHEOL, (that is Hel) doth ſignifie in the ſcriptures, as well the pangs, as the place of Hell: the words of the 16. Pſalme yeeldeth you no better warrant, for applying the one to Chriſt, then vs for applying the other. But you grant that SHEOL doth ſignifie in the Scripture, as wel the pangs, as the place of hell. *Ergo* that place is as pregnant & ſtrong for vs as for you. Hold faſt, ſet to your ſhoulder M. Doctor. Your cart will walter, if that ſpoake breake. Now heere beholding the *maior*, and the *minor*, two braſen & vnbreakable walles: you ſet all your teeth on the poore concluſion to pull it from them. To take this place of this Pſalme quite from vs, you alledge the holie Ghoſt, and Peter: two ſufficient witneſſes: becauſe they referre this place to the reſurrection, and we to the paſsion. Allace (good Doctor) *vbi acumen tuum?* Doe not you ſee man that though the negatiue, *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in hell*, pertaineth to the reſurrection? yet the affirmatiue, that his ſoule was in hell, may pertaine to his paſsion? *Peter* alledgeth the negatiue in the Pſal. to proue his reſurrection: and our queſtion is not whether hee roſe againe, or not? but whether the thing wherein he was, is to bee taken for the place, or the panges of hell. And heere I muſte needes confeſſe, that this conſideration hath driuen mee quite from *Calvine*, whome in this place I firſt followed. As for the place of the beleefe, I am perſwaded, that his ſenſe is moſte agreable: beeing godlie, conſonant to the Scriptures, neceſſarie for the perfection of the creede, not repugnant to the circumſtances thereof, and moſte comfortable to a Chriſtian conſcience. But in this place of this Pſal. now I ſee that *Oleuians* opinion is truer, more conſonant to the reſt of the text, and more plaine, againſt your drouſie dreame. Wherfore, now I am perſwa-

ded, that SHEOL is heer set for the ſtate of the dead, and my ſoule for mee, as it is Pſal. 3.2. *Manie ſay to my ſoule*, that is, to mee. And Pſal. 7. 2. *Leaſt hee devoure my ſoule lyke a Lyon*, that is mee. And Pſal. 6.3. *My ſoule is ſore troubled*, that is, I am ſore troubled. So the ſenſe muſt bee, *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in Hell*: that is, mee amongeſt the deade. That this muſt needes bee the true ſenſe heereof, I haue two reaſons. Firſt, that this was the SHEOL wherein Chriſtes ſoule was not left, whence hee roſe againe, as may appeare by this allegation of *Peter*. But hee roſe again from the graue and condition of the deade, not from hell, and condition of the damned. *Ergo* the SHEOL wherein Chriſts ſoule was not left, is the condition of the dead, and not the place of the damned. The anſwere here, that he roſe in ſoule, and body: the one from hell, and the other from the graue, will not holde: for the name of reſurrection, belongeth onelie to the bodie: becauſe nothing ryſeth againe, but that which death laide downe. So hath our beleefe the reſurrection of the bodie, not the reſurrection of the ſoule. This was *M. Fieldes* argument, which did choake you in the act at *Oxonford*: and hang ſo faſt in your teeth, that hee coulde not get it out of your mouth, much leſſe an anſwere to it. The other, is builded vpon the wordes of Peter. Act, 2.19. *Men and brethren, I may boldlie ſpeake to you of the patriarch* Dauid, *that hee is dead and buried, and his ſepulchre is amongeſt vs to this day*. In which wordes, expounding this place of the Pſalme: *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in hell, nor ſuffer thy holie one to ſee corruption*: hee laboureth to proue that *Dauid* ſpake not this of himſelfe, but of the *Meſſias* that was to come of his loines. His reaſon is, becauſe Dauid is deade and buried, and his ſepulchre remained amongeſt them: as if he had ſaid, becauſe *Dauids*

ſoule

ſoule was left in Hell, and ſaw corruption. For where the negatiue is not true, there the affirmatiue muſte bee true, by the rule of contradiction. Whereupon thus I reaſon. *Dauids* ſoule (that is Dauid himſelf as I haue ſaid before) was left in the SHEOL wherin Chriſts ſoule ſhould not be left. But Dauids ſoule was left in the ſtate and condition of death: *Ergo*, it was the ſtate and condition of death, wherein Chriſtes ſoule was not left, by this place. The ſame argument may bee formed negatiuelie: to take away your expoſition of this place. *Dauids* ſoule was left in the SHEOL wherof it is ſaid in the Pſalme, *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in Hell, nor ſuffer thy holie one to ſee corruption*. But Dauids ſoule was not left in the place of the damned: *Ergo*, it is not the place of the damned, whereof it is ſaid in the Pſalme, *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in hell, nor ſuffer thy holie one to ſee corruption*. Wheras ſome alledge againſt this interpretation, that it doeth violate the text: taking the ſoule firſt for the whole man, & the whole againe for the bodie. Let them conſider, that the condition of the dead, expreſſed heere in the name of SHEOL, pertaineth not to the body only, but to the whole man. Neither were it injurie to the text, if it be ſo taken. For the cup is ſet for wine, and wine for the blood of Chriſt by Paull himſelf, who vſeth not to violate wordes. Theſe reaſons therefore haue led mee from *Calvine*, whome though I reuerence (as he is well worthie) as much as anie man: yet I am not ſo maried to him, (how ſoeuer M. Doct. is perſwaded otherwiſe) to followe him the bredth of a haire, beyond truth and reaſon. Hee may bee deceaued, aſwell as others, though he hath plunged through manie deepes, that haue devoured manie. Nowe to returne againe, and to followe vpon your walke: you charge mee heere (as euerie where) with an vntruth. To faſten it vpon mee, you turne my

wordes out of their figured coate, into their bare skinne. For whereas I ſay, that Chriſt ſuffered the whole tormentes of hell vpon the croſſe, taking the droſſe by a *Synecdoche* for the whole paſsion, as he did before mee; which ſaid, *God forbid, that I delight in any thing, but in the croſſe of Chriſt. The preaching of the croſſe, vnto manie fooliſhnes. Chriſt reconciled vs to God by his Croſſe.* You tell mee, that it is moſt vntrue: becauſe he did not ſuffer his whole torments on the wodden Croſſe, which *Symon* the Cyrenian did beare on his backe. And to make my wordes more odious, you do them more injurie. For whereas I ſay, hee ſuffered the whole tormentes of Hell on the Croſſe, a thing defendable: you charge mee, as ſaying he ſuffered all his torments vpon the Croſſe, (meaning the Croſſe of wood) a thing without ſhewe of truth. In the ende, to faſten another little faulte on me, (it is but blaſphemie,) you wring my laſt wordes in the ſame preſſe. For, whereas I ſay, that a word of double ſignification, ſtandeth at the courteſie of the reader, to be taken as ſhall ſeeme moſt probable: meaning that there is nothing in the word it ſelf, to lead the mynde to one ſignification more then another: but depends vpon the probable circumſtances, and drift of the text: you charge mee, as making the Scriptures like a noſe of waxe, to bee ſet which way mens fantaſie will bend it: a thing as farre out of my penne, as out of my heart: and as far out of my heart as it is out of your heart, to take my words as I ſpeak them.

1. Cor. 1. 18. Heb. 12. 2. Epheſ. 2. 16.

Hvmble bis 5. Sect.

BVt that hee neuer was there, hee is too curious that will not ſtand content with Chriſtes owne teſtimonies. *Father, into thy handes I commend my ſpirit.* And in another place, *This day ſhalt thou bee with mee*

in Paradice. And heere it is a world to ſee, how men on your ſide labour to put out this candel. Firſt, you ſay, that this place, *Father into thy hands I commend my ſpirit*, is borrowed of Dauid, and muſt bee taken in the ſame ſenſe, as Dauid vſed it before. But you muſt conſider, when we vſe other mens wordes, either we cite them as teſtimonies, or vſurpe them by imitation. If we bring them in as witneſſes, wee may not alter their teſtimonie; but if wee imitate them, wee may without impeachmẽt, apply them to what ſenſe beſt may beſeeme our purpoſe. In this place Chriſt citeth not Dauids wordes, to teſtifie of his paſsion: but imitateth Dauid, in commending his ſoule into the handes of God. Where you ſee, that no neceſsity inforceth the ſame ſenſe. But, be it ſo, and I thinke it is ſo, and that it maketh much againſt you. For ſeing Dauids ſoule commẽded into the hands of God was neuer in Hell: it will follow, that Chriſtes ſoule commended to the ſame protector, was lykewiſe neuer there: except you will aſcribe leſſe vertue to Chriſts prayers, then to Dauids. But Dauids ſoule, ſay you, went not ſtreight way into heaven, becauſe he lived manie yeares after. That he liued anie long time after, if it were denied, you will hardlie proue it. But that maketh not to the queſtion, when Dauids ſoule came into heauen. But whether hee that commendeth his ſoule into the hands of God, doth purpoſe that it ſhall deſcend into hell: proove that, and you ſhall haue the goall. As for Dauid, he hauing deuoured heauen in hope, doubted not (if he liued anie long time after) to ſpeake that in the præſent time, which he was well aſſured would come to pas. And ſeeing Dauid was a figure of Chriſt, and ſpake manie things in his owne perſon, which aggree better with the perſon figured, then with the figure: theſe wordes may bee vnderſtood, as the caſting of lottes Pſal. 22. 16. 18

lottes on his garment, and the digging of his hands and feet. Wherefore, if you will answere this place, to the satisfaction of them that dissent from you: you must bring proof, that hee that meaneth to goe to Hell, doth commend his soule into the handes of God: or els you shall neuer bee able to darken the light of this Sunne, with anie cloude of Sophistrie.

HILL his reply.

The Paralogismes in the D. reply.

68. No more but som shew I warrãt you.

69. that future time, is in voice, not in sense.

70. That is not my argument.

71. We say, he went not to hell at all.

72. When you make the argument, you may put what you wil in the conclusion.

73. You beg the question.

74. Wherfore M. Doctor? Bring this therfore into mood and figure.

Indeed if these woords were spoken in the present time, some 68 shew of truth were in your woords, but in the Greeke they are in 69 the future-tence, πατερ εἰς χειρας σου παραθησομαι το πνευμα μου: Father into thy hands I wil cõmit my spirit. 70 Now your argument is this: Christ commended his soule vnto his Father, *ergo*, 71 immediatly he went not downe to hell. 72 Heere is more in your conclusion then is in your premises. You may conclud, his soule went to heauen: But not immediatly: 73 for it went to hell as I haue proued before, for hell in the 16 Psalme, doth not signifie the sorrowes of hell, but the place, as I haue confirmed already. 74 Therefore, it is better to translate, I wil commend, then I do commend, as Stephanus on this place noteth. Paule sayth, Eph. 4. and 10. verse, 75 Now, in that he ascended, what is it, but that he first descended into the lowest parts of the earth. He that descended, is euen the same that ascended farre aboue all heauens, to fulfill all things. 76 Now, if the same Christ did first descend which did ascend, then 77 he descended in soule and body, as he ascended in soule and body. 78 For both these he

75. This text is handled in the 8 section of purpose: and is therefore heere an vntimelie frute. 76. He is the same περι κατ ουσιαν και αληθειαν. 77. This is new diuinitie, that Christ descended from heauen in soule and bodie. 78. A fallacie *ab accidente*. These must be effected after a wonderfull manner. Ergo in soule and bodie.

must be effected in a wonderfull maner, for they are reckoned by Salomon amongst the most stupendious works of the 79 Sonne of God. Pron. 30. 4. Who hath ascended vp to heauen, and descended, who hath gathered the winde together in his fyst? who hath established all the ends of the world? By this scripture 80 I inferre, that to ascend and descend, are 81 as miraculous works, as to create and gouerne the world. But if the 82 soule of Christ did goe to heaue immediatly, as you affirme contrary to this text, then the descending of Christ had not bene so marueilous as his ascending. Besides, 83 as you alleage, there is but one ascending, but if Christs 84 soule first went to heauen, & then his body, then were there two ascensions. But 85 euen as Christ was but once borne, and once dyed, and once buried, and once rose from the dead, and but once commeth into iudgment: so (as Cyprian saith in his Sermon of the ascending of Christ) Christ did once descend into hell, they shall see God no more on the crosse, nor they that are damned in hel. 86 Wherefore may it please you to accept the iudgement of Athanasius a Greke Father, & a man persecuted for the truthes sake by the Arrians, he in his Creede saith thus, who suffred for our saluation, and descended 87 into hell. And interpreting the 1. Cor. 3. writeth, Satan was enuious against our sauior, for he killed him, not knowing that it wold make against himself, for Christ after his cros going down 88 into hel, hath vanquished death. And because he knew no sin be could not be holde of deth. Thus you see, that not only Hill, Augustine and Ierome doe say, that Christ after hee had vttered these words (into thy hands I will commend my spirit) but

79. Salomon speaketh not there of the sonne of god, see the text.
80. A wrong inference.
81. A fond cõparison, without warrant of the text.
82. ἀναχωρησιν
For this is vnderstood of his descẽding into his humaine state, being the son of God: a thing as wonderfull, as his descending into hell.
83. This thing is true, but wher alledge I it.
84. It followes not, see the answere.
85. 86. What makes this to the expounding of this place, Father into thy hãds &c. or answering any thing that I haue said heere?
87. Hee saieth the conditiõ

not the hell of the damned. He speaketh of his buriall. 88 he meaneth of death. He vanquished not death in hell.

89 Athanasius a Greek father, who better then you
vnderstood the meaning of these wordes. 90 There-
fore, it is a wonder to see how those of your side labour
to extinguish this everlasting light of Gods truth, &
set vp a consuming candle of your owne making.
Where you teach that Christs Soule did no more de-
scend into hell then Dauids did, therin you are decea-
ued. 91 For Christ was to deliuer vs from hell &
Dauid also: wherefore if Christs soule had not gone
to hell, Dauids must, and true and yours. 92 And
for this cause as you say, they are true in Christ figu-
red, but not in Dauid the figure, and hereupon Peter
thus reasoneth, that they could not be true in Dauid.
For Christ soule was in hel, 93 and yet not tormen-
ted, & his body in the graue, but not corrupted; wher-
as Dauids body saw corruption, and if his soule had
gone to hell it had found no redemption. Therefore,
to be in graue, and returne without corruption, and
to be in hell and returne with 94 conquest of the di-
uell, were two peculiar things to the Sonne of God,
& not to any other of the sons of men. And heere you
vtter an other 95 blasphemy, that Christs soule had
no other 96 prerogatiue then Dauids soule, for by
the same reasone you may argue, that Christs 97
body had no greater prerogatiue then Dauids body,
for as this is false, so is the other. For as Athanasius
saith in his booke of the incarnation of the word,
Death could not prevaile on the humane soule of
Christ to tye him there, neither corruption inuading
his body, & by tirauny could shewe her force on him
to putrefaction, as things not well seene vnto, for to
thinke so of him, were a wicked thing: for euen as
Adam had a double punishement inflicted on him for
his disobedience, the on was on his body, earth thou
art

89. This conclusion followeth not on the cited place.
90. You conclude as stoutly lie, as if all things were without dout.
91. Not by descending to the hell of the damned. He performed that on the Crosse.
92. I know not whereof you speak: if you meane these wordes wherein we stand, Father into thy, &c. If they be not true in the figure: the erre you that giue them the same sense in Christes mouth
93. Who doth now peece the text quot the wordes if you can.
94. He conquered the Diuels on the crosse, not in Hell.
95. No les then blasphemie.
96. where say I so.
97. what if I did? excepting innocencie it had no other prerogatiue, that I knowe.

art, and to earth thou shalt returne, and so by this decree, the body of the Lord departed vnto the earth: but to the soule hee said, Thou shalt dye the death. Hereof it commeth to passe, that man is deuided into 2. parts, and is condemned to depart to 2. places, and therefore it was necessary, that the selfe same Iudge, which had made this decree, that hee by himselfe being vnder the colour of a condemned man, should free from that sentence all beleuers. 98 Here you see by this learned Father, that Christs soule went to hell 99 to deliuer our soules from hell, and his body to the graue, to deliuer vs from death, & by this meane both body and soule personally, and not potentially 100 (as you teach) working our deliuerance from death and hell, haue those prerogatiues, which 101 Dauids soule and body had not. And for this consideration, though 102 the one was in the graue, and the other in hell, yet both were in the handes of the Lord. Heere then wee must learne what the hands of the Lord do signifie. Sometime the hand of god doth signifie the Sonne of God, 103 Psal. 144. 7. Send thy hand from aboue. Sometime it signifieth the power of God, Psalm. 136. 12. With a mighty hand, and outstretched arme. Thirdly, the bountifulnes of God, Psal. 145. Thou openest thy hand, and fillest euery liuing thing with thy blessing. Fourthly, it signifieth consolation, Ezec. 3. 22. The hand of the Lord was with me comforting me. Fiftly grace, Psal. 118. 16. The right hand of the Lord hath done valiantly. Sixtly, it signifieth the gift of prophetie, Ezec. 8. The hand of the Lord fel there vpon me. Seuenthly, mercy. Psal. 37. 24. Though he fall he shall not be cast off, for the Lord puttethvnder his hand. Eightly. the protection

98. To the locall hell I see not: but I see that you quote him to proue that Christes bodie hath greater prærogatiue then Dauids, which thing he saith not.

99. So did he on the crosse.

100. Where M. Doctor? sclaunder? fye for shame.

101. This is contrarie to the scriptures Heb. 2. 17. & 4. 14.

102. why then did he not likewise commend his bodie into the hands of God.

103. It is not

in that place set for the sonne of God, see the place. 104. Heere is a heap of notable ignorance. Hath the hand as manie significations, as it can be applyed to vses? If not, heere is od stuffe: if yea, heere is not half a handfull of hands.

tection of the Lord, Psal. 31.15. My times are in thy hand. Ninthly, the aide of the Lord, Psal. 74.11. Why withdraweſt thou thy hand. Tenthly, the puniſhment of the Lord, Iob. 19.21. Haue pitie on me (ô yee my frinds) for the hande of the Lord hath touched me. 105 Laſtly, it ſignifieth the Gouernment of the Lord, Psal. 95.4. In his hand ar al the corners of the earth. This place therefore, 106 muſt needes haue this conſtruction: into thy conſolation, mercie, protection and gouernment, I will commend my ſoule. I hope 107 you your ſelfe commende your ſoule into the handes of God euery day, but yet you minde not to goe to heauen immediatly. So ſaide Dauid, Psal. 30. 5. Into thy handes I commend my ſpirit, but hee went 108 not to heauen in manye yeares after, neither did Chriſt aſcende into heauen in many dayes after, 109 but went downe to hell, where it was in the protection and gouerement of the Godhead, 110 which as you confeſſe deſcended into hell. For as we being in the damned worlde, are in the protection and hand of the highest, ſo 111 Chriſt being in the place of the damned, after a wonderfull manner, was alſo in the Lordes aide and protection, by meanes whereof, he hath wrought our deliverance from hell. Therefore, proue you that Chriſt went ſtraitway to heauen, and you ſhal effect that which many of your ſide haue attempted, but 112 neuer yet any coulde bring to paſſe. 113 It is written of Procuſtes, that if any were too ſhort for his bed, he would not ſtretch thē out, and make them fit for his lodging: 114 ſo you, this place being too ſhort to fit your walk, will enlarge it with a worde (immediatly) which is not the place primitiue

105. If this be laſt, at which of all theſe hands ſits Chriſt? but that is a right hand, & perhappes theſe be left handes.

106. If ſo, then tell mee why he kept that prāier to his laſt gaſp, which might haue had more vſe in the troubleſome daies of his life.

107. That I do & my body to but the caſe is not like.

108. Are you ſure of that? then let vs heare your proofes.

109. *Petitio principij, plus quam crambe odioſa.*

110. Wher mā I haue ſaid that the deity preſented the triumph of Chriſts victorie to heauen earth & hell at once. That

the Deitie deſcended into Hell. to my knowledge, I neuer ſaide. 111. *Petitio principij* againe. 112. What ſay you to Chriſt then? He ſaid, that he would bee that day as he ſuffered, in Paradice: is he no bodie with you? 113. If euer *Procuſtes* had a preintiſe, you ſerued your yeares in his occupation, who made Peter ſay, that Chriſt was in Hel, & not tormēted, &c. 114. I neuer ſowed that patch to the text, ſee the anſwer.

or derivatiue, , expressely, or by way of implication. Moreouer, where you say, if I will answer this place I must proue that he that mindeth to go to hell, doth vse these words. I wonder that you dar vse such 115 blasphemous speeches, for hereby you insinuate, that Christ was 116 but a meere man, & that other men haue a part in the work of our redemption aswell as Christ. For as he is our only Sauior, so as Luth. saith on Gen 21. Chapter. This was singular in Christ, (Thou shalt not leaue my soule in hell, nor suffer thy holy one to see corruption) for his 117 soule could not be detained in hell, nor his body in graue. For as this was singular in Christ, that hee did giue vp his ghost, 118 so was it singular in him, to go to hell and returne again. 119 Ambrose saith, *Tradidit spiritum suum quia non inuitus amisit, quod enim emittitur voluntarium est, quod amittitur necessarium.* He gaue vp the ghost because hee lost not his saule against his will; for that which is emited is voluntarie, but that which is amitted is necessary. 120 Theophilact sayth, hee cryed out with a loude voice and gaue vp the ghost, for he had power to lay downe his life, and take it vp again. Now when you can proue that you or any of your side 121 haue this power in you to dye when hee will, and liue againe when hee will, then will I proove that hee that speaketh these words (Into thy hands I commende my spirit) hath an intent to goe to Hell. But as Christ his birth was a singular 122 thing in him, so was his death, burial, descending in to hel, resurrection, and assension into heauen. Eccle. 8.8. Man is not Lord ouer the spirite, to reraine the spirit. 123 And Iohn 10.18. Christ saith, No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it downe of my selfe: I haue power to lay it downe, and power to take it vp a-

115. Blasphemous speches and yet nothing but misbegotten insinuations. This geare hangs well together.

116. For all your cunning my words are cleare.

117, 118. *Petitio principij his hic, millies alibi repetita.*

119. 120. Two impertinent allegations.

121. Thére there goes a bargan If you wil not proue the one I promise you I will neuer proue the other. But til then, let this Syllogisme stand for good. You cā not proue that he that commēds his soule into the hands of god meaneth to go to hell: but Christ commended his soule into the hands of God

Ergo, you cannot proue that Christ ment to go to Hell. 122. Yea againe: *Deus bone quoties.*. 123. Two impertinent allegations.

124. What makes that to the queſtion heere in hand

againe. By theſe 124 two places it is euident, that no man can lay downe his owne ſpirite, but the only ſonne of God had that prerogatiue, and therefore as the laying downe of his ſpirit, and the taking vp of his ſpirit againe was wonderfull: ſo was 125 the ſtate of the ſoule and body, during the time of the ſeperation of the parts of the humanity, ſingular and wonderfull.

125. Speak to the purpoſe, man.

Abſurdities admitted in this ſect. by the D.

Firſt, that Chriſt did deſcend in ſoule and bodie, take it how he will, is abſurde. If he meane into Hell, taking Hel as he would haue it, that is in ſoule onlie. If into the graue, it was in bodie onelie. If into the wombe of the Virgine. It was in Diuinitie onelie ανθρωποπαθως.

Second. If Chriſtes ſoule had not gone to the locall Hell, Dauids muſt, and his and mine: contrarie to the ſufficiencie of Chriſts ſacrifice.

Third. That Chriſtes ſoule and bodie, beſides innocencie, had other prerogatiues then Dauids had. Contrarie to the Scriptures, that he was like vs in all things, ſinne onelie excepted.

HYME *his reioynder.*

INdeede ſay you, if theſe wordes were ſpoken in the preſent time, ſome ſhew of trueth were in our aſſertion. Then, if I can proue theſe words to be ſpoken in the præſent time: you will grant vs ſome ſhew of trueth, which is more then commonly, you vſe to yeelde. Firſt, you know, that by a Hebraiſme, the future time, may bee ſet for the preſent, eſpeciallye when continuance is ſignified. Now, that it muſt be ſo heere, I hope this Syllogiſme will perſwade you. That verb which ſignifieth an action preſentlie done when it is ſpoken, is of the preſent time. But this

verbe

verbe παραδιδωμι doeth signifie an action then presentlie done, when Christ vsed these wordes: *Ergo*, this verbe is of the present time. The *maior* is a rule of Grammer, from the definition of the present time of a verbe. The *minor* is cleer of it self, because Christ did then commend his soule into the hands of God, when he vsed these wordes. But if this will not satisfie you, take this to proue, that it cannot be the future time. That action which can bee referred to no time to come, cannot be the future time: But this action cannot be referred to anie time to come: because he presentlie gaue vp the ghost, and men after death commend not their soules into the handes of God. *Ergo*, this action cannot be of the future time. And now, hauing taken all this paines, to gaine nothing in your eies, but a shewe of trueth: I must put you in minde, that though this verbe did pertaine to the future time: yet your knot is in the wrong rushe. For it is not the time when hee did commend, but when his soule came into the handes of his Father, that must helpe you, if you could bee holpen. And therefore, you may whissel presentlie for anie future help, that the future time of this verb can yeeld you: to shew my judgement of this place, all things both in heauen, earth, and hell; be in the hands of God, that is, in his power: to dispose of them as it seemeth meetest to his owne glorie. But that cannot bee the sense heere: because his soule was in that sense in the hands of God, euen then, when he did commend it. The hand is the instrument of receauing, in which we take those things that we bring into our own peculiaritie, and proper possession. In that sort Anthropopathetcially, those soules and spirits which stande in the presence of God, are said to be in his hand. Of which it is said in the Psalme, *In thy presence is the fulnesse of ioy: and at thy right hand, pleasures for euermore.*

And

And ſo Chriſt being in the agonies of death, and hel; doth commend his ſoule into the handes of God to poſſeſſe a fulneſſe of joy, and æternitie of pleaſures. Like to this is *Stephans* prayer, Act. 7. *Lord Ieſus receiue my ſpirit*. Heere, after your wonted guiſe, you forme my argument as pleaſeth you, and then you tell mee it is falſe. If it be falſe, you made it ſuch. If the fault had not beene more in your skill, or your will, or both; then in the matter: you might haue made it *inferio*. No man that commendeth his ſoule into the hands of God, meaneth to go to hell: But Chriſt, as man, did commend his ſoule into the hands of God: *Ergo*, he ment not to go to Hel. And if he meant not, I am perſwaded, hee went not. If you had framed it thus, there had beene no neede of *Procuſtes* with his racke, nor of anie patche to make it fit our waſte. To the *maior* of this argument, for lack of better mater, you crie out, blaſphemie. And then finding no blaſphemy in the words themſelues: you tel me that they inſinuate, that Chriſt is but a meere man, and that others haue part in the worke of our redemption. Your inſinuations are verie deepe. But heere M. Doctor, I will offer you a good bargaine. Hooke me this inſinuation on my propoſitiō in mood & figure, and I will neuer write more againſt you on this queſtion. And now I muſt needes note an eſpeciall grace in your writing. When the argument pincheth you, you wring it with a crooked wreſt, and ſtraining out ſome filthie licour, that you your ſelf had powred vpon it, you call witneſſes to ſhewe the worlde, what filthie geare it is. And ſo with manie teſtimonies, in thinges that no man that hath one dramme of ſenſe will denie, you make vp a ſhamfull, and importable booke. Heere, to proue that Chriſt is our onelie Saviour, (a thing not denied) you bring in *Luther*, *Ambroſe* and *Theophilact*. Neither apply you them to the purpoſe

purpose, though the purpose be easier to proue; then the things you apply them to. But your wandering hand, cannot beate on one Anvil. And wheras I taking the vantage of your construction of these words whereon we stand, *Father into thy handes I commend my spirite*: thus proue, that Christs soule went no more to Hell, then Dauids. If these wordes haue the same sense in Christs mouth, as they had in Dauids, Christ soule went no more to Hel, then Dauids did. But you say, they haue the same sense, *Ergo*. you let goe the *maior* and the *minor*: and take vp your vsuall hubub against the conclusion, exclayming and crying out, blasphemie. Then running about, and seeking *Athanasius* in euerie corner, to chide mee: because I giue Christs soule and body no greater prerogatiue then Dauids, you bring him in, not saying one word to the purpose. For he (good-man) knew right well that Christ was like to Dauid, and vs all; in all things sinne onlie excepted: and therefore would not speak against his conscience. As for the prærogatiue that you woulde haue him to haue, to goe to hell, it is so base a one (if it was anie) that if Bishoppricks were no better, Doctors woulde not shoulder for them, like beggers at a doall. Whereas you argue, that if Christs soule had not gone to Hel, Dauids must, and yours and mine: if you meane the hel of the damned (as you must if you speak to the purpose) it is absurd. For Christ redeemed vs on the Crosse, where hee did beare the hellishe burden of our sinnes: and not in hell, where hee paied not one dram of our debt. To set a wrong sense on this place, you bring foorth a heap of handes, inough almoste to remoue Cheviot hill to Charing Crosse. Whereupon you conclude, that the sense must needes be: Into thy consolation, mercie, protection and gouernement, I will commend my soule. If that was his meaning, why did he

not commend his bodie alſo in the hands of his Father? And why delaied he this praier till the ſtorme of his miſeries was blowne ouer. If this concluſion, did follow vpon the premiſſes, it were a fault to confute it. But nowe I hope vpon a pardon, though I wipe it away with a Syllogiſme. Conſolation perrayneth to the diſtreſſed, mercie to the guiltie, protection to the weake, and gouernment to them, that either cannot, or will not keepe order. But Chriſtes ſoule, after this praier, was neither diſtreſſed, guiltie, weake, nor diſorderlie: *Ergo*, he commended not his ſoule into Gods conſolation, mercie, protection, and gouernement. This is all, that in all this ſection, you haue ſpoken to the purpoſe. You haue (I muſt needs confeſſe) a great deale of other ſtuffe, as much as all this. In one place you ignorantly charge vs, that we giue Chriſt not a perſonall, but a potentiall diſcending into Hel. For we ſay, that Chriſt deſcended perſonallie into Hell, both bodie and ſoule, and ſuffered actuallie all the torments thereof, for our redemption. Otherwiſe, were he but a potentiall Saviour, and all wee actuallie condemned. You quote alſo heere out of place, and to ſmall purpoſe, the 10. and 11. verſes of the 4. to the Epheſ. which might haue bene deferred more conuenientlie, to the 8. 9. and 10. ſection, where it is handled of purpoſe. Out of it you gather firſt an abſurditie. That, if the ſame Chriſt did aſcend, and deſcended: hee deſcended in ſoule and bodie, or elſe he could not haue beene the ſame. Did you neuer heare, that the ſame Chriſt was from all æternitie: that the ſame Chriſt was ſlaine from the beginning of the worlde: that the ſame Chriſt lay three dayes in the graue, as *Ionas* was three dayes and three nights, in the whales bellie. And yet I truſt, you will not ſay, that his ſoule and bodie was from all æternitie: that his ſoule and body was ſlain

That is called potentiall which being is not impoſſible, neuer was indeed

from

from the beginning: & sure I am, that you that stand so much, that the soule can not bee buried, will not say, that hee lay three dayes soule and bodie in the graue. Your wonderfull manner, in which you say these things were effected, is a wonderfull Sophisme. You seeme to thinke, that there were no wonder in Christes descending, except this place be vnderstood of his descending into hell: as if it were not as great a wonder, that the sonne of God descended into the wombe of a Virgine, and there did cloath himself in mans nature. But all this wonderfull discourse of wõders, is beside the text. After all these by-blowes, you gather vpon this text a reason, against the main conclusion. That Christs soule was not in heauen, while his bodie laie in the graue: becausse then hee should haue ascended, before he descended, contrarie to the place of the Eph. There be two errours in the levelling of this peece, that beares it quite beside the marke. First, you giue the name of ascending to the soule, without the bodie, contrarie to the Scriptures Act. 2. 34. *Dauid is not yet ascended.* And this taketh away your next reason, of two ascensions. Secondlie, you giue the name of descending, to the descending of his humanitie into hell, which is spoken by the Apostle of the Descending of his Deitie in his humane state. Thus a man may see your wit, howe cleanelie and closelie, you can lap two fallacies into one proposition.

HVMS *sect.* 6.

FOr the other place, you bring a reddier sense out of *Augustine* of that which is God, & not of that which is man, his sense, (how readie soeuer it pleaseth him to teatme it) can nowise stande with these wordes of our Saviour: *For this day shalt thou be with me*

in Paradice, doth ſound in all latine eares (I mean to all that vnderſtand the latine tongue) as if hee had ſaid. *This day thou and I ſhall be in Paradice:* which no man that hath one drop of braine in his head, dare aduiſedlie attribute to the Deitie, which being there from all æternitie, could not go thither in the future time. But, mee thinkes, I heare you ſay, that the future verbe is giuen to the theefe onlie: and (*with me*) which agreeth to the ſpeaker, is limited with no bounds of tyme. Againſt this, I haue the conſent of the beſt Grammarians, and the theefe alſo: For, *Remember mee* (ſaid he) *when thou commeſt in thy kingdome.* By whoſe verdict, it is cleare, that he was not yet in his kingdome, to whome he made this ſupplication. Neither do I thinke, that Chriſt himſelfe did miſlike with his iudgement. For if hee had erred of ignorance, no doubt, hee would haue ſet him right. But he was ſo far from correcting him, he rather confirmed him, anſwering in the ſame tenſe or time, *Thou ſhalt be with me*, &c. Moreouer, the Pronoun *me*, is referred to the perſon that ſpake, which I hope you wil not ſay, was Chriſt God alone, but Chriſt both God and man. Thus, you ſee, that theſe two places are too ſtrong for your ordinance. If you haue no better ſhot then theſe, we will ſpred our banners with *magna eſt, & inuicta veritas.*

Great is the truth and invincible.

HILL *his reply.*

The Paralogiſmes in the D. reply.

HEre you condemne S. Auguſtins anſwer. Well, becauſe S. Auguſtine is dead; and in your margine you ſay, that it is M. Hills anſwere, by Gods grace and his worde, M. Hill will defend it, 126 Firſt I note a falſification of the text, by you alleadged: for where as it 127 is in the text: Luke 23.42. Remember mee Lord when thou commeſt into thy king-

126. You ſclander, I falſefie not the text.

127. Not the originall.

kingdome. You for 128 (Lord) say (Maister) I tolde you in the begining, Eue did change the words of the Scripture, to her ouerthrowe. 129 Therefore, I pray you leaue it, for otherwise I must tell you of it: if a boy in the Grammer schoole construe Kupie Maister, 130 hee is worthie to be beaten: and if a schoolemaister teach so, 131 he is worthy to be controlled: for this worde Kupie writen by Stephanus 132 with a capital letter, will cashire your banner of 133 boasting, & bring your glorie to shame. I preached in my sermon at Chippenham, that to day, did signifie for euer, and (with me) did signifie the Godhead. I will not only affirme it, but 134 confirme it, that to day doth signifie for euer in this place: first I proue it by this philosophicall reason out of Aristotle, which saith: *In aternis non est tempus*, In eternall things there is no time. 135 For time, is the measure of motion: therfore, if there be time, then is there motion. Now, as in Hell all men do suffer torments, and in earth all labour: So in Heauen all doe rest. Apoc. 14. 13. Blessed are the dead that dye in the Lord, so saith the spirit, 236 for they rest from their labours. 137 Therfore, where there is no mutation from day to night, nor from summer to winter, there is no day naturall or artificiall, 138 as you suppose. And this is proued Apoc. 10:6. And the Angell sware by him that liueth for euermore, which created heauen and the things that are therein, 139 that time shall be

128. Not for but I trãslate a word Maister, that signifieth master rather then Lord.

129. If a man may leaue a thing, that he neuer began, I will graunt your sute.

130. He is him self worthie to be beaten, that can bear a boy for that faulr.

131. Such a controuller were scarse worthie to beare office in a hen-hous

132. A doughty argument. then was I be holden to your printer that wrote the word which I vsed for it with a capitall M.

133. It is a weake boaste, that will bee so beate with a capitall K. 134. How well you confirm it, see the answere. 135. You promise to proue your purpose by Aristotle, and leaue your purpose to proue that you bring out of Aristotle 136. This proueth not that they moue not. They rest from their labors: that is, their mouing is not laborious. It will be hard for you to proue, that the Angels and blessed soules moue no more, then the meruelous stones vpon the plaine of Salisburie. 137. This therefore dependeth not vpon the premisses. 138. If I did so suppose, I were as farre from sense, as you from honestie, in charging mee with a sensesse assertion, which you neuer heard from my mouth, nor read after my pen. 139. This allegation is impertinent: time was not ended, when Christ said to the theefe, This day, &c.

no more. And this word σημερον to day, is vsed for (euer) 140 in many Scriptures. Psal. 2.7. Thou art my Son, this 141 day haue I begotten thee. Act. 13.33. & we declare vnto you touching the promises made vnto the Fathers, god hath fulfilled it vnto you their Children, in that he hath raised vp Iesus, even as it is written in the second Psalme: Thou art my Sonne 142 to day haue I begotten thee. And in the epistle to the Hebr. 1.5. And, to which of the Angels said he, Thou art my Sonne, to day haue I begotten thee. And againe, Hebr. 5.6. He proouing Christ to be a priest for euer, thus saith. Christ tooke not to himselfe this honor, to be made an high priest: but he that said to him, Thou art my Sonne, 144 to day haue I begottē thee, as he also in another place speaketh. Thou art a priest for euer, after the order of *Melchisedech*. 145 Heere Dauid & the Apost. do take this word (to day) to signifie (for euer). And so doth 146 S. Augustine and M. Hil against all the gainsaiers of it in the world: For the circumstances of the place, do 147 strongly conuince it. For what doth the theefe aske? 148 forgiuenes of his sinnes: who 149 can forgiue sinnes? God only. He asketh 150 for grace, who is the giuer of all Grace? 151 God only? hee desireth 152 glory, who giueth glory and life euerlasting? God 153 onely. That God onely 154 forgiueth sinnes, it is proued Mar. 2.7. That he is the 155 giuer of al grace, it is manifest 1. Pet, 5.10. That God 156 only giueth glorye and life euerlasting, it is euident 2. Tim. 4.8. Rom. 6. & last verse. 157 Secondly, wher shal he receiue this glory? in Paradice. For as much 158 then, as the thing that is giuen is eternall, the person that giueth it is perpetuall, the place where it is giuen is everlasting: 159 it must of

140. All these manie scriptures, are but the repetitiōs of one prophecy out of the 2. Psalme.

141. 142. 143. 144. Heer, this day, doth not signifie æternity, see the answere.

145. Vntruth they take it not so.

146. The place would be quoted.

147. Not very strongly.

148. *implicite*, not *explicite*.

149. This circumstance is far fet.

150. *implicite*, not *explicite*.

151. This circumstance is far fet.

152. *implicite*.

153. This circumstance is far fet.

154. This is not denied.

155. This needed no proof.

156. This proof is superfluous.

157. This circumstance is far fet. 158. Frame one good syllogisme out of al these circumstances, to proue, that (to day) doth heer signifie æternity, & take the bucklers. 159. But not that the day when it was giuen, doth signifie æternity.

of neceſſitie ſollow, that the time alſo, be world without end. And that (with me) ſignifieth as I do teach, the Godhead: it is conſtantlye auouched 160 by all the Fathers. 161 Ierome on this place noteth. Chriſt brought the theef from the croſſe to Paradice, leaſt any man ſhould think conuerſion to be too late at any time: hee made the puniſhment of homicide Martirdome: the truth being counted among the wicked, he left the one on the left hand, and tooke the other on the right hand, as hee will doo in the day of iudgement. It 162 were an abſurd thing to ſay, the ſoule of Chriſt only ſhall giue iudgement in the laſt day. 163 Auguſtine hath the like on this place, The croſſe, if you marke it is the iudgement ſeate, the Iudge was ſet in the middle, the one theefe which beleeued was deliuered, the other which blaſphemed was condemned. To ſaue and condemne is the office of the 164 Deity: and therefore 165 (with mee) ſignifieth the Godhead, as the other theef no doubt was with the Diuill. 166 Ambroſe in his Sermon of the holy theefe writeth thus: He ſaw him hanging on the croſſe, and praieth to him as though he were ſitting in heauen: he ſeeth them condemned, and yet he praieth vnto him as to a king. To this accordeth Damaſcene handling this place. In reſpect of his body he was in graue, in reſpect of his ſoule in Hell: and as 167 God, he was both in Paradice with the theef and in the throne with the Father & the holy Ghoſte. Therefore Ferus a writer not to be contemned, interpreteth theſe woords thus. *Mecum eris quiſquis vbiq; omnia in omnibus.* Thou ſhalt bee with mee which am euery where all in all. In Exodus 34, 6. 7. verſes, bee ſet

160. Haue al the Fathers written vpon this place? you range wide.

161. This place hath not that (with me,) doth ſignifie the deity

162. Wil not Ierome ſpeak plainelie? this collectiō hath in it three paralogiſmes. 1. Ieromes *ſimile* of the fact, you refer to the perſon. Secondlie you ſeeme to think that we hold that Chriſts onlie ſoule did iudge the theef on the croſſe: and laſtly, that his only ſoule was in heauē with the theef.

163. Nor this place hath it not. 164. And of the ſonne of mā. Mar. 2. 10.

165. I deny the argument. 166. He ſaith not, that (with me) doth ſignifie the Deity. 167. Damaſcen commeth neereſt you, and yet he ſaith not, that (with me,) doth ſignifie the deitie: his ſoule was not ſeparated from his Deitie.

set downe the 13. 168 names of God, and Lord is one of the first of them. Therefore, when the theefe calleth Christ Lord, he 169 acknowledgeth him to be God, and desireth to dwell with the 170 Godhead, in whose presence is the fulnes of ioy: where you aske me how the 171 Godhead can goe to heauen, the worde is ἄπαξ: Euen as 172 God came downe from 173 heauen, so is he said to goe vp to heauen. 174 If you will read Augustine in this booke of the essence of the Diuinitie, he will teach you. Psa. 68, 24. They haue seene ô God, the goings of my God and king, which art in thy sanctuary, from heuen he came into the virgins wombe, after his birth hee was laid in the cratch after that he had fulfiled al for the which he was sent of his father, he was fastned to the crosse he was taken downe from the Crosse, he was buried in respect of his flesh, but in soule hee descended into hell: the third day by the power of the Diuinitie, hee raysed his flesh out of the graue, and after the dayes of his resurrection, the fortieth day, his Apostles seeing it, he ascended into heauen, & sitteth at the right hand of the Father, that is, in his glorie. The 175 theefe then praieth to Christ, that as hee should sit at the right hand of the Father in glory, so he might be partaker of that glory, and that hee might haue his perfect consummation and blisse in heauen as Christ should haue after his ascension: & that his vile body which was partaker of the sufferings of Christ, might also bee partaker of his glory, and made like to the glorious body of Christ Iesus. Twise you haue told me that (thou shalt be with me) is as much as (I and you) 176 but you bring neither scripture nor father to

168. They be Epithets, not names, saving the first, neither be they 13.

169. A fallacie *ab accidente.*

170. If so, that proueth not that *with me* signifieth the god-head.

171. I ask you how it cã go to heauen in the future time.

172. Not so: He is said to come downe: when he sheweth his presence amongst men by effectes. he can not be said so to ascend.

173. This is contrarie to your reason at Chippenham, and in the 11. fol. pag. b. of your printed sermon. Ther you reason that the worde πορευθεὶς can not belong to the godhead, because it signifieth motion. And heere you giue God contrary motions both vp and down. 174. August. speaketh of the ascending of the humanity 175. This glosse on the theues prayer, is ἥτιστον ἁχθοφόρημα.

to confirme it in that sense that you meane it. But if you mean thus, I and thou shall be together, that is, thou shalt be 177 partaker of the glory of the Deity as thou hast ben partaker of the suffrings with the humanitie, it is true. For, what neede had the theef to pray for the 178 presence of Christs soule, when he 179 had the presence both of body and soule. But it is the presence and fellowship of the 180 deuine nature that he prayeth for, 181 wherin as Dauid saieth, is the fulnes of ioy & pleasure for euermore. Psa. 16. 11. In Luke. 13. 26. The Iewes say, we haue eaten and drunken in thy presence, and thou taught in our streetes. Christ thus answereth in the 27. and 28. verses. I tell you I know you not, depart from me all yee workers of iniquite, there shall be weping and gnashing of teeth: when you shall see *Abraham Isaac* and *Iacob* in the kingdom of God, and your selues cast out of dores. Therefore it is cleere, they are not all blessed 182 which were present with Christs humanitie, but they of whom Saint Peter saith, 2. Pet. 1. 4. Whereby most great and precious promises are giuen vnto vs, that by them we should be partakers of the nature of God. For therefore did Christ take vpon him our nature, 183 that wee might bee partakers of the nature of God, and be on with Christ, as he is on with his Father. Christ prayer is to this end, 184 Iohn. 17. 21. I pray not for these alone, but for them also which shall beleeue in mee through their word, that they all bee one, as thou O Father art in me, and I in thee, euen that they also may be on in vs.

177. I neuer meant such a gloss

178. That was not his praier see the text.

179. This reason would wel confute the theses prayer, (if it were cõfutable,) Remember mee when thou commest in thy kingdome

180. And had he not the presence of that, as well as of the soule and bodie?

181. This is a grosse reason, In the presence of the Deitie, is fulnesse of ioy, *Ergo*, the theef praieth for the presence & fellowship of the Deitie

182. This is another new conclusion. 183. How proueth this that (with mee) in this text, doth signifie onlie the God-head. 184. This allegation is also impertinent.

Two abſurdities by implication, in the D. reply.

That to ſaue and condemne, is the office of the God-head onlie, and not of the humanity, contrary to Mark. 2. 10. Act. 10. 42. and Ioh. 5. 27. Or elſe the collection out of *Auguſtine* will not holde, that (with mee) doth ſignifie the God-head onelie.

That the theef prayed not for the preſence of the bodie and ſoule which hee had: but for the preſence of the diuine nature: as if the deuine nature had euer bene abſent from the ſoule and bodie, contrarie to the *Hypoſtaſis*, and vniting of the perſons.

HVME *his reioynder to the 4. ſect.*

OVr reaſon is, if Chriſt went that ſame day as hee ſuffered to Paradice, he wēt not to Hell amōgſt the damned. But he went that ſame day to Paradice. *Ergo*, he wēt not to hel, amōgſt the dāned. For the *minor* we haue Chriſt himſelf witnes. Luk. 23. 43. You replied at *Chippenhā* out of *Aug.* that this promis to the theef (*Thou ſhalt be with me*) is ment onlie of the God-head of Chriſt, and not of his ſoule. To that anſwere I rejoyned (ſaving *Auguſtines* reverence) whome I honour as farre, as it is meet to honour a man, what euer you beare your reader in hand to the contrary: that this being ſpoken in the future time, and implying an abſence, at that preſent, from his kingdome, could not pertaine to the Godhead, being at all times in all places. That heere is implyed an abſence, it is cleare by the theefes ſute, *Remember mee when thou commeſt into thy kingdome.* And that this is ſpoken in the future time, it is manifeſt by Chriſtes anſwere, *Thou ſhalt be with mee in Paradice*: which by a rule of Grammer is, as if he had ſaid, *I and thou ſhall be in Paradice*, which is a plaine future tenſe. Nowe, heere

heere in this your reply, you paſſe by this teſtimony of this holie theefe, and him in whome was neuer found theft nor guile, as if you looked for better witneſſes. If theſe be not ſufficient, I haue no better: but I hope the reader will eſteeme better of their wordes, and count mumme, but a meane anſwere. Yet if you were half ſo worthie your ſcarlet hood, as manie do hope, and you do think: there was left you more ſhewe of a probable reply. That theſe thinges be ſpoken of the Deitie *per κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἰδιωμάτων*. Wherfore to preuent your hope, if you chance to finde it heereafter, I will now teare the boſſe from that bukler. This figure is neuer applyed to anie text, but when ſome inconuenience in the letter, will take no ſalue, but ſuch a corraſiue. But this text (if it be well handled) needeth no ſuch hard plaiſter. *Ergo*, this figure is not to bee applyed to this text. Heere, neglecting the anſwere that had anie ſhew of probabilitie, and replying nothing to my argument, to make ſhew of ſome thing, you pick two quarrels to mee in your written copie, of which you ſcrape out one (for ſhame) in your print, for falſefiing the text. The firſt is, that I tranſlate κύριος Maiſter, and not Lord. The ſecond, that I tranſlate σήμερον not to day, but this day. Where I pray thee marke gentle Reader, that though I were guiltie of both theſe faultes: yet my argument drawn from the future time, ſtandeth betweene both theſe blowes, without tip or tap. But becauſe it is a hainous matter to peruert the Scriptures, I will not confeſſe a crime ſo odious, being innocent. And now M. Doctor, if you were a Schoolmaiſter, as you were ſome time, and would ſeem yet; and did beat your Scholler for conſtruing κύριος Maiſter; men might ſay, that you were more worthie of the rod, then he. κύριος & δοῦλος be relatiues in greke as *ſeruus* and *Dominus* in latine: and Maiſter and ſer-

Servants obey your maisters.

vant in Englisʃh: ſo are they vſed Eph. 5. 6. Col. 3. 22. and 4. 1. δοῦλοι ὑπακούετε τοῖς κυρίοις Nowe then, if the engliſh of δοῦλος be a ſervant, the Engliſh of κυριος muſt be a Maiſter. Neither is it denied, but that in ſome caſe, it may be Engliſhed, Lord. Some ſervants haue Lords: and all Lords exerciſe a magiſteriall power ouer their vaſſals. As for this place, it ſeemeth to expreſſe the Hebrew RABBI, which was to them a cõmon ſtile of dignitie, as Maiſter is in Engliſh. And therfore in my ſimple vnderſtanding, ſo far is it from hereſie, that this ſeemeth the fitteſt Engliſh, to meete that greeke in this place. But you beat mee with two ſore arguments: the one that *Stephanus* doeth write Κυριος with a capitall letter: the other, that in the 34 of Exod. bee ſet downe the 13. names of God, and κυριος is the firſt of them. You were much beholden to *Stephanus*. If he had chanced to write κυριος with a ſorting letter, you had loſt the beſt argument that euer was bred with your mothers milke, and a weapon to caſhire our banners. But they be not *Babilonian*, as you imagine: they are as I ſaid, and you ſee the banners of truth that will not be caſhired with a capitall K. As for the 13. names of God, I neuer obſerued onlie ſo manie: neither can I finde juſt that nomber in that place, whither you ſend mee. The firſt name in that place, and the onlie name for any thing that I can ſee, is IEHOVAH, the very eſſential name of God. The reſt be Epithets, not names. But tell in good ſadneſſe M. Doctor, is κυριος the ſame in greek, that IEHOVAH is in Hebrew? I euer tooke IEHOVAH, to come from HAIAH: a verbe of beeing, to declare, that God the cauſe of all beeings, hath no cauſe of his owne beeing. And κυριος I tooke to expreſſe the rule and commandement which hee doth exerciſe ouer his creatures. But ſay you, the theeſe when hee called him κυριος did cal him God. If that

be

bee of neceſsitie: then *ſervants obey your maiſters*, will ſoũd ſervãts obey your Gods. You will not (I hope) ſtand to this Divinitie. As for the tranſlating of σημερον (this day,) if I was deceaued, the greek and latine deceaued mee. For ſeeing σημερον is as τηµερον that is, τῇ ἡμερᾳ ταυτῃ: and *hodie* compounded of *hoc die*, did meete the ſame: I thought I wanted not reaſon to tranſlat it (this day.) But if this be hæreſie, how will you couer the ſame wart on your own noſe, fol. 20. pag. 1 of your printed ſermon, & here in this ſame ſect alſo. Your reaſon why it may not be tranſlated (this day,) is; that to day is an indefinite, & this day, a particular. But this was ſo ſubtile, in your printed copie, that you are aſhamed of it: & good cauſe had you. For σημερον is ſo particular of it ſelf, that it is no more capable of more particularitie, if it bee tranſlated (this day;) then *Adame Hill* Vicar of *Weſtburie*, and Parſon of *Gooſage*, can be made more particular by ſaying, this *Adame Hill* Vicar, &c. This Logick reacheth far beyond the præcepts that you learned in the Vniverſitie: and yet I ſee, that it commeth much ſhort of that which is in you. For, you will not onelie affirme it, but confirme it alſo; that *hodie eris mecum*, is aſmuch, as *eris mecum in æternum*. If you wil make that good, you may goe whether you will; no hedge can holde you. The Scripture hath by way of compariſon, that 1000. yeares are as one day in the ſight of the Lord. If all æternitie bee in your ſight, but as one day: you muſt be ſome *magnus Apollo*, ſo much greater then God, as æternitie is more then 1000. yeares. But, what can you make of 1000. yeares, that can make ſo much of one day. One day I am ſure, is not the proper name of æternitie. And therefore I would faine know of a man of your skill, ſeeing when one word vſurpeth the place of another (except it be like the Popes *ſtatuimus* for *abrogamus*) it muſt

Thou ſhalt be this day with me, is aſmuch as thou ſhalt be with mee for euer. Pſal. 90. 4.

muſt be either *effectum pro cauſa, ſubiectum pro adiuncto ſimile pro ſimili pars pro toto, aut contra*: to which of theſe heades you will referre *bodie pro æterno*. If you thinke it *pars pro toto*, then in your conceit, the partes of a thing infinite, muſt be finite, contrarie to an axiome eſteemed for truth amongſt other men: that an infinite thing, is not deuide-able. Heereof commeth the maxime, that you after alledge out of *Ariſtotle*, that in things æternall, there is no time. You by it, (entiteling it the Philoſophicall reaſon of *Ariſtotle*) vndertake to proue, that one day, doth ſignifie æternitie: but ſtreight way, by nimble conueiance of legerdemaine, you ſlip the thing you promiſe, & turne your hand to proue *Ariſtotles* philoſophicall reaſon. For, if there be time (ſay you) in æternitie, then is there motion. Thus, like a merchaunt that fraughting his ſhips with corne to go to *Deep*, when ſhee is lanched forth into the ſea, turneth his ſaill, and pointeth to *Spaine*: You pretending to proue, that one day, muſt needes heere ſignifie æternitie: fall to proue that in æternitie there is no time, a thing neuer denied. But reaſon woulde haue hewed an other peece of worke, out of *Ariſtotles* block; In æternitie there is no time: In one day, there is time. *Ergo*, one day is not æternitie. But to proue this, you alledge four texts of ſcripture, which are all but the repetitions of one, out of the 2. Pſalme, wherein you are deceiued your ſelf, & labour to deceaue others. For (to day) in that place doth not ſignifie æternity, as *Iunius* proueth finelie in his Parallels. The words be, *Thou art my ſonne, this day haue I begotten thee*. Wherein (ſaith hee) is noted, firſt the æternall begetting of his Deitie, in theſe wordes, *Thou art my ſonne*: and the temporall begetting of his humanitie in theſe wordes, *to day haue I begotten thee*. His reaſon is drawne from the place of Paule, which heere you quote, Act. 13. For, he alledging this place

to

to the Iewes in their Synagogue, as a plaine argumẽt of Christs Diuinitie, could neuer haue hoped to effect that amongst such a froward companie, if he had put such a violent face on the text, as to take one day for all æternitie. To this most excellent reason, I add another out of the same text. This place of the psalm doth proue, that God raised vp Iesus to fulfill that promise to the Children, which he before had made to their Fathers. But that promise was then performed, when Iesus was given to them in the flesh. *Ergo*, this place of the Psalme, must haue relation to that day, when the sonne of God, which was before all æternitie, was giuen to the Iewes in the flesh. Notwithstanding these reasons, if it were granted you, (which you can neuer proue) that (to day) in this place of the Psalme doth signifie æternitie, yet it will not follow, that it must needes haue the same signification in these words of Christ likewise. Wherefore to fill this ditch, you fal to worke vpon the text. In it you make a long harueſt of little corne, telling in manie wordes, that grace, glorie, & æternall life, the things giuen, are æternall. But, what makes the æternitie of the gift, or of the giuer, to proue that the time wherin it was giuen, is æternall? Of things æternall, onlie God (who is æternitie it selfe) is without beginning, and ending. Grace, glorie, and æternall life, imparted to his creatures of the fulnesse of his æternitie, haue a beginning then when they are giuen, though their continuance be æternall. Now, in these words, *This day thou shalt bee with mee*, (this day) noteth the time, when this æternall gift should begin, and not the continuance and durance thereof. This may suffise to crush all the small bones of your shrimpish arguments. As for your Fathers & Doctors, whom you alledge not directlie, but by such consequentes, as you pinne to the tailes of their gownes, I will passe

them ouer, for breuities sake: and because you haue promised in the 3. sect. not to relie on men in this question.

HVME *Sect.* 7.

BVt now to come to your reasons. First, you muster all your forces, about the Hebrew and Greeke, against the most learned of this age. It will coast you a great deale of eloquence, to perswade the worlde, that *Tremelius* and *Iunius*, *Calvine* and *Beza*, and the translaters of the Geneva Bible, with manie more excellent men, that spent their age in that studie, did not know these words as well as you, & had as great care to sift out the truth. For my part, neither is my skill so great, neither am I now minded to stand with you vpon that point. I see no inconvenience to hurt vs, nor vantage giuen you: if I grant that SHEOL must be englished, Hell, in the place of the Psalme, which you cite. Onelie this I stand vpon, which I haue said, that this word is manie times vsed in the Scriptures for the torments of hell, and must needes be so taken heere. The verie order of the wordes, will ouerthrow your conceit. *Thou wilt not leaue my soule in Hell, nor suffer thy holie one to see corruption.* For, seing the Hell, that his soule should not bee left in, commeth before the graue, wherein his bodie should not see corruption: what hell went before his burial, but onelie that of his passion: wherin he paied the whole ransom of our redemption, and nailed the handwrite that was against vs, to his Crosse.

The greatest Hebricians of name in our time both Protestants & Papists, Mercerus, Cevalerius, Bertramus Vatablus Pagninus, Arius Montanus, Andradius, with I know not how many more.

HIL *his reply.*

The paralogismes of this sect 185. TWo 185 vntruthes are in these fewe wordes. First, you make much adoe about SHEOL against

No vntruth in my wordes.

againſt 186 almoſt all the learned men of this age 187 There ar on my ſide 188 Luther; Æpinus, 189 Felinus, 190 Pomeranus, Lucas Loſſius, Seluecer, Vrbanus Rhegius, The authors of the Centuries, Eraſmus, Chytreus 191 Molerus, 192 Peter Martyr 193 Lauaterus, Prouerb. 27. In *England* 194 Lambert, 195 Robert Samuel, 196 Latimer, Becon Hutchinſon, 197 Fox, and 198 Nowell. Heere 199 are 20. moſt learned men of theſe latter times, as I can ſhew you in my poore Library beſides that moſt learned and reuerend Father M.r Allen, and beſides the aduiſed iudgement of the learned Conuocations of *England*, not only in King Edwards raigne, *Anno Domini*. 1552. but alſo ſince the raigne of her 200 Maieſtie. 1571. In the which Conuocations I am perſwaded, were as learned men, as any were, either in *England* or *Europe*. Therfore, the learned reader muſt either thinke you a man 201 of little reading, and that you neuer ſawe theſe learned mens workes, or elſe of greate malice, 202 that you will diſable al theſe for learning, who left a better teſtimonie behinde them then euer you wil, vnleſſe you haue more then you haue ſhewed in this anſwer. The other 203 vntruth is, that SHEOL in the 16. Pſalme, doth ſignifie the torments of hell, which Chriſt ſuffered in his paſſiõ on ỹ croſſe. That this is vntrue it is manifeſt

186. My wordes are *contra doctiſſimos huius etatis*, therfore turn this lie to your own ſecretary

187. Al theſe be not on your ſide.

188. Luther holdeth that Chriſt ſuffered in Hell, ſo do not you.

189. Felinus is againſt you

190. So is Pomeranus.

191. Molerus is your aduerſarie.

192. Peter Martyr, holdeth that his ſoule preſented it ſelf to both the bleſſed and the damned.

193. Hee maketh nothing for you. 194. Nor Lambert. 195. Nor Robert Sammell. 196. Latimer holdeth with Luther, not with you. 197. Fox hath nothing for you, but the Printers picture in the beginning of his booke. 198. Nowell holdeth not with you. 199. Manie of theſe vnderſtood not the Hebrew, & therfore ſtood not for you vpon the word SHEOL. a. M. Allet I think you would ſay. He wrot the poore mans Librarie, for the poore, not for Doctors. 200. That convocation allowed Nowels Catechiſme, not your opinion. 201. If he thinke ſo, his thought is too true. But yet a man may haue read more then you, that neuer ſaw theſe bookes. 202. I diſabled none of them: except you will beleeue your Secretary better then my ſelfe. 203. This was my concluſion. Men vſe not to call the concluſion a lie, before they anſwere the antecedent.

204. You labour in vaine, this is not denied.
205. A ſenſles tranſlation liketh you beſt.
206. You wold haue ſaid, how can yee finde, to point where, & aske where I can finde it, is like him that ſaid, I payd 18. d. for my ſhoes, read what they, coſt me.
207. He reioiced, becauſe he ſhould not be left in torments, will that anſwere ſerue your turne?
208. Who ſaid ſo? You fight with your owne ſhadow
209. Who would make concluſions & father thē on his aduerſarie, but hee that wanteth both ſcience to anſwere, or conſcience to

teſt not by conceit, but by Pet. Sermon, Act. 2. 31. Hee knowing this before ſpake of the reſurrection, that his ſoule was not left in hell, nor his fleſh ſaw corruption: You ſay it is ſpoken of the paſſion, Peter ſaith it is ſpoken of the reſurrection: 204 and good cauſe hath he ſo to ſay, for the words going before, and cōming after do proue it. The words going before are theſe, *Pſalm.* 16, 9. Wherefore my hart was glad, my 105 glory reioyſeth, my fleſhe alſo ſhall reſt in hope. The words following in the 11. verſe are theſe: Thou ſhalt ſhewe me the path of life, in thy preſence is the fulnes of ioy, and at thy right are pleaſures for euermore. 206 Where can you finde your torments, in the word 207 (glad) or in the word (reioiſeth) or in the word (reſt) or in theſe words (fulneſſe of ioy) or in theſe (pleaſures for evermore.) 208 Was Chriſt glad of his torments? Did he reioiſe or wepe in them? 209 Who would deliuer this doctrine but hee that wanteth either ſcience or conſcience, or both. 210 To lye once is a fault, but affirme it twice is a greater fault. To ſpeake a lye is hurtfull, but to write a lye aduiſedly is more hurtfull. To lye in a matter politicall is dangerous, but to lye in deuine matters without ſpeedie repentance is damnable. 211 You ſay noe vantage is giuen to me nor inconuenience to you, if you grant SHEOL to be hel: Let your frinds iudge 212 what vantage you haue geuen to the truth, and ſhame to your ſelf 213 by gainſaying Saint Peter, and by 214 affirming, that in the reſurrection are torments, where Dauid and Peter ſay, are fulnes of ioy and pleaſures for euermore. Therefore, it is the ſaying of Peter, 215 that Chriſts ſoule was not left in hel,

acknowledg the truth. 210. Al theſe lies doth bliſter on the lips of the blab that bred them. 211. If that be not true, why confute ye it not? 212. You alledge my wordes to play vpon the vantage 213. I gainſay him not. 214. Nor ſay not that. 215. The queſtion is, what the manner thereof ſhould be. This is *petitio principij*.

hell, and not my conceit, and it is deceit in you to 216 affirm the contrary. Further, where you say that Tremelius and Iunius, are better learned in the Hebrew language then my selfe, I confesse it, 217 so are the Iewes them selues then Tremelius and Iunius. 218 shall I therefore beleue the Iewes? no more will I beleue the Translation of 219 any other learned man, if he disagree with Dauid and Saint Peter. Finally, to answer 220 your curious question, you aske me in what hell was Christ soule before his buriall? To this I answer, in that hell whither all 221 Infidels goe for their vnbelefe. I reade but of one Hell, if you 222 knowe any more let mee see your proofe, and thē wil I tel you into what hel, Christ descēded. 223 But who but you doth thinke it an vnpossible thing for 224 a soule to descēd into hel, before the body be buried? The soule in an instāt passeth to heauē or hel, but the body I am sure must haue time to be buried: for bodies 225 are in places circumscriptiuely: Angels and soules definitiuely, and God is in all places vniuersally. And the soule came out of hell into the body, before the body could come out of the graue: 226 therefore most aptly it is said, Acts 12.31. Thou shalt not leaue my soule in hell, nor suffer my flesh to see corruption. 227 228 For as August. saith in his 57. epistile ad Dardanum, That was spoken of his soul, which cam from hel so quickly, this of his body

2 which

216. And falf-hood in you to charge me with that I neuer spake.

217. That is but your conceit. I see no reason for it.

218. Why not? if they teache the truth.

219. The by-asle of this bowll did run on Tremelius and Iunius, & with the jutte of an ilfavored rub: did break vpon others It is well that you feare to say that they disagree from Dauid & Pet. Your heart faine woulde, if your penne durst venture.

220. You call my question curious, & by your answere proue it to want curiosi-

tie. Such inconsequencie follow your pen as close, as your shadow your body. 221. And did it return thence also, as the words of the Psal. doth proport, before his buriall. 222. Know not you that it hath 3. significations as well as I. 223. Who but you did euer say, that a soule could descend into Hel, and not being left there, return again before the buriall of the bodie. 224. Heere you holde that Christs soule did descend before his buriall: and in the order of the articles of the creede, you make it an argument for you that it commeth after. Thus you can turne your nose to euerie winde. 225. Lo, you will proue a thing that no man denieth. 226. This (therefore) follows not on the premisses. 227. 228. Two vnfit allegations. The question is whether Hel going before his buriall is to be taken for the paines or place of Hel, which thing Augustine heere toucheth not.

which could not corrupt by reason of his speedy resurrection: and writing on the 85. Psalme, he saith, wherfore this is his voice in the psalme, not by any mans coniectures, but by the exposition of the Apost. Thou shalt not leaue my soule in hell, nor suffer thy holy one to see corruption.

Hvme *his Reioynder.*

IN this section, I followed *Caluine*: from whose iudgement I am nowe departed on this place of the Psalme, as said is before sect. 4. Yet that the reader may see how neare the trueth *Caluine* creepes: I will defend him from all this wyde shot, and cleare my self of these hainous accusations. First, you begin with vntruthes: there is nothing so much in your mouth. It should seeme that the moulde is not vnfit for such matter, that casteth so much shot of that sise. But if you had not beleeued your secretarie, better then my owne copie: the first of these vntruthes had neuer founde the waye from your owne lippes. My wordes are, *Tu multa de nominibus inferni contra doctissimos huius aetatis disputas*. As for your favorits in the end of my Epistle, I graunted, that you wanted not the countenance of sundrie great writers: who rather said as you say, then confirme their saying by Scripture, or reason. My wordes were, *multos habet, fateor, & magnos patronos causa vestra, qui ita potius censuerunt, quam ratione sententiam suam confirmarunt*. Notwithstãding all this, you runne such a treble on mee with vntruthes: that if I would runne the counter-tenor, you would blushe to heare the discorde of your owne descant. As for your 20. authours, first they were not all Hebricians, nor vnderstood the word wherin you say, they tooke your parte. Secondlie, though some of them drewe neere your opinion: yet they neuer

wrote

wrote of SHEOL to bee taken, as you will haue it. Thridlie, *Peter Martyr* held that the ſoule of Chriſt did preſent it ſelf to all the dead, aſwel the bleſſed, as the damned. Fourthlie, *Luther* and *Latimer* holde, that Chriſt ſuffered in Hell. Fiftlie, *Loſſius* and *Hemingius* holde, that the whole Chriſt, as he was borne of the Virgine Marie, deſcended into Hel, Sixtlie, *Mollerus* affirmeth that your opinion cannot be proved by this place of this Pſalme. Seuinthly, *M. Nowell* holdeth that Chriſt by the vertue of his death did pearſe to the dead, and the damned Hell. Eightlie, *Lambert* ſaith nothing for you, but onelie quoteth a place out of *Auguſtine*, to another purpoſe, wherein *Auguſt.* ſeemeth to ſay, as you ſay. But *Lambert* neither lyketh nor diſlyketh it. Nynthlie, *Robert Samuell*, ſaith no more for you, then the verie wordes of the beleef. Tenthlie, in *M. Foxes* book of Chriſt triumphing, ther is not anie thing for you, but the Printers picture, which you haue alſo ſet before your owne booke. Laſtlie, *Felinus* and *Pomeranus* are with vs, and againſt you. Such is your skill to bleare the blinde, & make him thinke, that your foes are your friends. Thus if a man could intend to trace you, he might finde you quatt in manie buſhes, where you want couer to hide your bunne. If anie writer name but Hell, it is ynough to make you bragge, that he is youres. As for the other vntruth wherewith you charge me, it is anſwered ſect. 4. Yet becauſe you think heere to winn the ſpurres, and haue bragged amongſt your frends, that in this place you haue driuen mee ſo neere the hedge, that I can neuer eſcape you, without the foile; it may be, that that conceit may contem my anſwer. Prejudice is a ſtrong baye, and will beare a maine ſtrength before it breake. Wherefore heere I will onelie turn the cock, and make it ſpout the ſame water in your owne face, to make you faine to flee to my

cloake, to keepe your ſhoulders from the ſhoure. You holde that SHEOL in the 16. Pſalme doth ſignify the locall Hell, wherein the damned are tormented. That this is vntrue, it is manifeſt, not by conceit, but by Peters ſermon. Act. 2. 31. *Hee knowing this before, ſpake of the reſurrection, that his ſoule was not left in Hell, nor his fleſh ſaw corruption.*. You ſay, it is ſpoken of the locall Hell, wherein the damned are puniſhed, Peter ſaieth it is ſpoken of the reſurrection: and good caus hath hee, ſo to ſay. For the wordes going before, and comming after, do proue it. The words going before are theſe, Pſa. 16. 9. Wherefore my hart was glad, my glorie (to vſe your own tranſlatiõ, leſt you ſay, I alter your words) rejoiceth, my fleſh alſo, ſhal reſt in hope. The words following in the 11. verſe, are theſe. Thou ſhalt ſhew mee the path of life, in thy preſence is the fulneſſe of joy, and at thy right hand, are pleaſures for euermore. Where can you finde your locall Hell, wherin is weeping and gnaſhing of teeth, in the word (glad,) or in the worde (rejoiceth,) or in the woorde (reſt,) or in the wordes (fulneſſe of joy,) or in theſe wordes (pleaſure for euermore.) Was Chriſt glad of that doole-full and dread-ful place? Who would deliuer this doctrine, but hee, that wanteth either ſcience, or conſcience, or both. To lie once is a fault, but to affirme twiſe, is a greater fault: To ſpeak a lie is hurtfull, but to write a lie adviſedlie, is more hurtfull. To lie in a matter Politicall, is dangerous: but to lie in divine matters, without ſpeedie repentance, is damnable. Thus far you. This is your owne manerlie tale, filed on your owne vice, and taken out of your printed booke. Wherein you giue your ſelfe roundly and handſomly the ſingle-lie, the double-lie the hurtfull lie, the adviſed-lie, the dangerous-lie, & the damnable-lie. If I had blowne this wind in your face, you would haue ſaid, that I had beene bred in

an Oxe-ſtall. As for your opinion on this place of the Pſalme, I haue two ſore ſhot againſt it. That SHEOL heere can no waies bee the locall hell. Firſt it is in the Hebrew SHEOL, and in the 70. εἰς ἅδην: *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule to hell*: and this place of the Actes, εἰς ἅδου is not true greeke, except you vnderſtand οἶκον or οἰκίαν as you note your ſelf out of Clenard. ſect. 14 Now, thou wilt not leaue my ſoule to Hell, cannot be vnderſtood of a præſentiall beeing in the place of hell: *Ergo*, this place cannot be vnderſtood of Chriſt that he was in the locall Hell. If you bee ſo good a Græcian, as you would be taken, you ſhould not bee ignorant, that to make your ſenſe, it ſhould be εν ἅδῃ as it is in Math. 12. 40. εν τοιλια τοῦ κητους and εν καρδια της γης. The other is this. No man reioiceth that hee is deliuered from a place wherein hee ſuffered no ill; but Chriſt heere rejoyceth verſ. 26. and 27. that hee ſhould not bee left in SHEOL: *Ergo*, SHEOL is not heer the place of the damned, wherein you ſay, he triumphed, and joyed, and ſuffered no kinde of ill. As for my ſcience and conſcience, which heere you ſtrike at, you praiſe them your ſelfe (ſuch is your conſtancie) in the beginning of your 12. ſection. I knowe mine owne infirmities, and dare not accept your praiſes. As for my knowledge, I am content that men count of it, as they finde it. As for my life, I dare not bragg neither will I ſpeake anie thing *abſolute*: but *comparate*, this much I will ſay, (ſeeing you put mee to it) that where wee are both knowne, I can finde more mouthes to ſpeake my purgation, (if I holde but vp my finger) then your ſelf can procure by freendes & meanes. You confeſſe, (which manie men wold think though you confeſſed it not) that *Tremelius* and *Iunius*, are better Hebricians, then your ſelf: and affirme that the Iewes are better then they. For my parte, it is beyond my skill to make compariſons: and my

Sic Sheol,

blinde eies can ſee no reaſon for that oddes. But as you will not beleeue the Iewes, (you ſay) no more will you *Tremelius* and *Iunius*, againſt *Dauid* & *Peter*. You haue reaſon for you. Yet til you proue it, other men will ſuſpect, that *Tremelius* and *Iunius* had both as much care, and as great judgement, to keepe in with Dauid and Peter, as you. And for anie thing we ſee, it is credible inough, that Dauid, Peter, and they doe drawe all one way. If you will beleeue the Iewes in nothing, you doe them wrong. If all men had been as hard laced as you, no man had euer gotten Hebrew of them. You anſwere the antecedent of my argument, which you call a curious queſtion, without curious meditation. It ſhoulde ſeeme that the queſtion was more curious in your tongue, then your eies, that you can anſwere ſo readilie. You trifle and tell mee, that you read but of one Hell. And I anſwere you, that he who in ſerious matters of faith can finde a cavill *a rebus ad voces*, will hardlie find credite of ſincere dealing. Did not you ſee, that I ſpake of the three things ſignified in that name, and not of the damneds Hell onelie, which hath almoſt gotten the Engliſh name to it ſelf, from the other two. For my part I neuer thought it a thing vnpoſsible, for a ſoule to diſcend into Hell, before the buriall of the body: but that Chriſts ſoule ſhould deſcend into hel and returne againe, (for ſo the wordes of the Pſalme doth ſound, (*Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in Hel*) before the buriall of the bodie, as the words do lie in order, I euer held it, and holde it yet a thing, that you neuer ſaw, and impoſsible for you to prooue with witneſſes. But in one thing you ſeeme farre heere to ouer-ſhoot your ſelfe. Your mates reaſon againſt vs, that the pangs of Hell, which went before the buriall, cannot bee ment by theſe wordes following it. You open your owne ſide to that blowe, and put the deſcen-

discending into the locall Hell, before his buriall also, and make that argument stronger against your self, then you finde it against vs. Thus you see, al this great winde is ouerblowne, and shakes no corne.

Hvm. *bis* 8. *Sect.*

HEere to let this passe, your next reason is from that place of Paul: *But that he ascended what is it els, but that he first descended into the lowermost parts of the earth.* Where you holde, that the lowermost partes of the earth, muste needes signifie the pit of Hell. Which thing if it were so sure, as you beare in hand; I wonder that no Diuines, (I speake of the modester sorte) did yet gather heereupon, that the place of Hell, were the verie center of the earth. But whereas you avouche so confidentlie, that ERETS TACHTITH, doth signifie Hel as properlie in Hebrew, as hel doth in English, (though I meane not to stand with you for the tongue) yet pardon mee to dissent from you in this. For in the places which you quote, it can not in my simple vnderstanding carie that sense. Your first place is, *They which seek my soule, shall go down into the lowermost partes of the earth*, which cannot bee meant of Hell: except these reasons deceane mee. First, it might seeme a presumption to enter so farre into Gods secrets, as to judge his owne priuate enemies. Next, it should seeme not to stand with the affections of a godlie heart, to ascribe that place to his enemies, out of the horrour whereof, there is no redemption. For the children of God, do rather pray for their enemies, & desire their amendement. This place may be wel construed of the graue. For it is an argument vsed by the Prophete, to lay the pride of them that sought his soule, and to solace himself recording that their hatred should haue an end, whē the graue should swallow them. The wordes following confirme this sense: *That they shall fal vpon the edge*

of the sword, which cannot be vnderstood, but of temporall death.

Hill his reply.

The paralogismes of this sect

228. I charged you not with immodestie, read againe.

229. These two vntruths wil proue not one.

230. Is it an vntruth to tel your own tale in your owne wordes.

231. Yet and you be remébred translating Lauater in the next sect. you cal it a pit.

232. You doe impudétly or arrogantly take which you will, misvse my words: read againe.

233. Heere ye settle your self to your olde trade, to

Indeed, I brought this place Eph. 4. 9. to proue that Christ descended into Hell. 228 And whereas you charge me with immodestly, for so alleadging of it: I must needs charge you with 229 two vntruths in answering this allegatiõ. The one is, that I called it 230 the pit of Hel, 231 which phrasse I neuer vsed. The other is, 232 you haue impudently auouched, that none of the modester sorte of diuines, haue euer alleadged this place to proue the descending of Christ into hel. 233 For many, and those both learned and modest haue alledged this place to this purpose. 234 Athanasius interpreting this Epistle and sorte, thus writeth. Into what place did he descend? 235 Into hel truly, which he calleth according to the cõmon opiniõ of men, the lowest parts of the earth. 236 Ambrose on this place saith thus. This Christ therefore, comming downe from heauen into the earth, was borne a man, afterward he dyed and 237 descended into hell, from whence rising the third day, he went vp to heauen before all mortall men, that hee might shewe deth to be vanquished to euery creature. 238 Chrisostome on this place saith, Hee went to 239 those partes of the earth, then the which nothing is lower, and from thence hee ascended into heauen, then the which nothing is higher. The like hath 240 Augustine li. de Trin. chap. 19. 241 Ieromo on this text thus

proue a thing, not denied. Your worke could not rise otherwise. 234 This witnesse needed not. 235 Hell may heere be taken for the graue. 236 This witnes is superfluous. 237 He saith not the thing he is brought to say, that the lowermost parts of the earth is Hell: and hel may also bee heere taken for the graue. 238 This witnes might haue ben spared. 239 He saith not, that the lowermost parts of the earth are hell. 240. This testimonie needed not. 241. Nor this needed not.

thus noteth. That 242 Hell is vnder the earth noe man doubteth, for he that descended in soule into hell ascended both body & soule into heaue. 243 Mollerus a learned Minister of Germany, on the sixtene Psalme saith: that the descending into hel, is plainly proued out of the Ephesians the fourth chapter. 244 Musculus on the 68. Psalm. thus writeth. This God which was in Christ reconciling the world vnto himself, first descended into the lowest 245 partes of the earth, then he lead captiuitie captiue, and not only we are deliuered from the captiuity of Satan, sinne, death and damnation: but also Christ triumphing ouer them as tirants, hath ascended aboue all heauens, to fulfill all things: 246 Hemingius on the 2. Chapter to the Colossians thus also teacheth. As by his death he conflicted with the enemye one the crosse, so by his glorious 247 descending into hell, resurrection and ascention, he triumphed as it is Ephe 4. Leading his cros vp as a monumẽt of his victory. To conclud 248 Alesius a very learned preacher of Scotland, on the 19. chapter of Iohn, affirmeth, that the 1. Pet. 3. & Eph. 4. do manifestly proue the descending of Christ into hell, & Athanasius, Chrysostome, Ambrose, Augustine and Ierome of the old fathers, and Mollerus, Musculus, Hemingius and Alesius of the new writers be all 249 immodest diuines, then haue you truelye saide: but if in the iudgement of the learned, all these were most reuerend men, then most 250 shameles are you to accuse them of the want of modestie. Goe ouer, where you say no diuine dare so dispute where hell is: 251 it is true in some sort, for no diuine can

242. Hel heer may be taken for the graue: & so it is likly seing it may be doubted of the place of the damned whether it be vnder the earth, or no:
243 Nor this witnesse needed not.
244. nor this.
245. But faith not that the lowermoste parties of the earth ar Hel.
246. This testimonie needed not, but on this same place 4. Eph. he denieth that it proueth the descending into the place of the damned.
247. In all this he speaketh not the thing he is alledged for.
248. This needed not.
249. This is a strange (if) I neuer said so. 250. Then what are you if I accuse them not, as indeede I do not.
251. If it be true in anie sort, how dare you say aboue, that Hell no doubt is vnder the earth.

242. An inco-
sequence. It
followeth not
becauſe men
cannot circū-
ſcribe hell,
Ergo, they
cannot know
where it is. Na
vigators can
not circum-
ſcribe the 15d
of Pepiniayes
and yet they
know that it
is between the
ſtraites & the
South pole.
253. If hel bee
infinite, there
is it no where;
and all that
you haue ſaid
confuted.
*infinitum nuſ-
quam eſt, nuſ-
quam locorum ſerrē.*
254. If heauē
and hell bee
both infinite:
then be there
three infinites
heauen, hel,
and God.
255. I deny the
argument.
256. That is
not the que-
ſtion.
257. Not the
like. There be ſpeaches of the wicked, heere of his enemies, 258. Calvine is alle-
ged to proue a thing not denied. 259. This is ſpoken of the Meſſias, and his ene-
mies, 260. When and where ſaid I ſo? 261. Not of his owne enemies I believe.

252 circumſcribe the place of hel which is 253 in-
finite, no: yet of 254 heauen: only the wo:d of God
affirmeth, that heauen is aboue Gal. 4. 26. And hell
is beneath, Prouerbs 15. 24. 255 Therefore, the lo-
weſt parts of the earth 256 may well be taken for
hel: Then you goe further & ſay, that ERETS TACH-
TIVH doth not ſignifie hell, Pſal. 63. and for this you
bring two reaſons: the one is, ỹ it were a preſumption
in the Prophet to iudge his enemies: 2. that it ſtan-
deth not with the affections of a godly minde, to a-
ſſign hell to his enemies, but to pray for them: to your
firſt reaſon this I answer, In the Pſalm 9. 18. Dauid
vſeth the 257 like ſpeeche. The wicked ſhall be tur-
ned into hell, and all the people that forget God,
which text Caluin thus 258 expounded, the He-
breue word SHEOL which was doubtfull, I haue
not doubted to tranſlate hell, for though it doth not
diſpleaſe me, that others turn it (Sepulcher) yet it is
ſure, heer is ſom thing noted beſides common death,
otherwiſe he ſhould ſpeak nothing of the reprobate.
but that which did generally happen to al beleeuers.
In the hundred and ninth Pſalme alſo, Dauid thus
prayeth: 259 Let Satan ſtand at his right hand, let
his prayer be turned into ſinne, let the wickednes of
his Father, be had in remembrance in the ſight of the
Lord, and let not the ſinne of his mother be done a-
way. Do you think this to bee ſpoken 260 preſume-
tuouſly? Many ſuch texts could I alleadge to proue
that Dauid inſpired with the ſpirit of prophecye, did
foretel, not only of the tragicall deſtruction of the bo-
dies of his 261 enemies, but alſo of the extreme da-
natiō of their ſoules. This the is my reply to your ſe-

cond

cond reason: these enemies were not 262 priuate enemies, but publick, and did hate Dauid for his religion sake: Dauid therefore by the gift of prophecie doth foretell, that their soules should go to hell to be tormented, and their bodies should be the portion of foxes, that is, should never come to the graue, for what need 163 Dauid tell vs they should dy, which we know is comm̃ to al, or how can that be true, which you say, that they should bee 264 in graue, when Dauid himself saith, they were not in any graue, but were the portion of Foxes. And so M. Caluin (whom I hope you will beleeue) teacheth you, writing vpon this psalme and verse. To be the portion of Foxes, is as much as to be deuoured and torn of wicked beasts for God (saith Cal.) doth threaten his punishement to the reprobate, that they shall bee a pray to Wolues & dogges, because he would depriue them of the honor of their graue. Heer you see 265 M. Caluin saith, they cam not into their graue, you say they did. How M. Caluin and you may be reconciled 266 I knowe not: for Caloin addeth this reason. It happeth some time that we know the same temporall punishments to be common to the good and the bad, but this is the difference, the bones of the godlie are gathered together and kept in safty, that none of them shall perish; but the scattering of the bones of the reprobate, is a signe of eternall destruction. 267 Therefore howe can the lower parts of the earth signifie the graue, as you say, since (as M. Calvine truly saith) they were in no graue. Answere mee this (good M. Hume) plainelie: Psal. 63. 9.

The lower partes of the earth 268 signifie, (not the graue) but hell. Christ descended into the lower parts of the earth, Eph. 4. 9. *Ergo*, Christ descended into hell.

262. This would be proued. And if it cã be proued, I will forgo this argumẽt: and yet I will hold still my conclusion: The conclusion may stand trew, though my argumẽt proue a jade.

263. This was answered, if you wil be answered

264. By a *Metonymia.*

265. But heer Calvine saith not that they came into the Sheol.

266. The you knowe not *Metonymia*

267. Caluin is not of this minde, read his comment

268. I denie the *maior.*

Two impoſſibilities in the D. *reply*:

That Hell is infinite, and that Hell is in the center of the earth: *Finitum, non eſt capax infiniti.*

That Hell and Heauen, be both infinite. *Non ſunt duo infinita.*

HVME *his Reioynder.*

Whereas I charge you with immodeſty, you ſay, you will charge me with vntruethes: you are marueilous chollericke. Good ſir bee content, you miſtake my wordes. I haue miſvſed neither you nor your frends: I onely ſaide, ſpeaking of the modeſter ſorte, that no diuines alledge theſe words, to proue, that Hell is in the center of the earth, which they might wel doe, if ERRYS TACHYTH did ſignifie Hell properly. You haue not done well to trouble your friends to proue a thing not denied. Here you call forth nine writers, and crye ſhame on me for miſvſing them. If I were as chollericke as you, I might take Pepper in the Noſe, and call you braineleſſe, for miſtaking my words: The meaneſt Carter in the plaine, would neuer ſo haue ouerlaſht himſelf: by ſuch ſhifts as this, you haue made your booke importable. If a man woulde peake out all ſuch ware as this, he woulde leaue you ſmall ſtore of ſtuffe to ſhew amongſt your cuſtomers. If you will runne this courſe, you can neuer want wordes, howſoeuer you ſhift for matter: but if you mend not, impertinent traiſh wil make men diſpaire, that euer you will be able to yarne a Biſhopprick with your penne. After all theſe out-cries, you confeſſe that whiche I ſaid, and ad a reaſon becauſe Hell is infinite. Though your reaſon be not good, yet your confeſſion will purge me, and ſtaine your owne face with your own boxe. That the lower-moſt partes of the earth, muſt

needs signifie Hell, thus you argue. Heauen is aboue and Hell is belowe: *Ergo*, the lower-most parts of the earth may be Hell. This reason was tayntd before it came at *Whately-bridge*, and neuer came into *Oxenforde* amongst so many Noses able to smel such ware, as farre as *Bullington-greene*, without a peall of S. Clements Belles: First, you conclude not the question. This question is not, whether the lower-most partes of the earth may be Hell: but whether ERETS TACHTITH be the proper name of Hell. Secondly, the place that you alledge out of the Proverbs, all interpreters agree not vpon that sence of the wordes. Lastly, if a man shoulde reason, Heauen is aboue, and and Hell is be low: *Ergo*, *Owkie* hole is Hell: you will laugh your selfe, though partiallitie will not let you see the same stupiditie in your owne reason. The first place that you alledge, to Proue that ERETS TACHTITH, must needes signifie Hell, is out of the 63. psal. They that seeke my soule, shall goe downe into the lowermost parts of the earth. Which place is so farre from prouing your conclusion necessarily: that wher one interpretour that euer I saw, doth interpret it of Hell, three doth construe it of the graue: which sence being agreeable to the rest of the Scriptures: I viewing the whole bodie of the psalme, and finding Dauid to speake onely of his owne private enemies, and no inducements to lead me to thinke, that he speaketh here, eyther in the person of Messias, or of his bodie the Churche: I gathered three reasons to disproove your sence. First, that it were a presumption: Secondly, contrary to the mind of the godly, to judg their own priuat enemies: And lastly, that the words following, they shall fall vpon the edge of the sword, can reach no further then to temporal death. To the last of these you say nothing, which of it self is strong ynough to carry this conclusion from you. To the o-

This is a miraculous hole on the edge of Mendipp.

ther,

ther two, you oppoſe the 9. Pſalme, 18. where the Prophet ſpeaketh of the wicked: and the 109. pſalm which containeth a prophecie of Chriſte, vttered in the perſon of David, Act. 1. 20. whiche places poinr beſides the marke, and proue not, that Dauid doth Iudge his owne priuate enemies, but the wicked and enemies of the Meſſias. Wherfore, though I ſcarſe truſt theſe two laſt reaſons: yet till I here them taken away by reaſon, I ſtand at my firſt marke ſtil, that Dauid ſpeaking heere of his owne privat enemies, is of Iobs minde, not reioycing at the deſtruction of them that hate him. Iob. 31. 29, 30. And here M. D. I would haue you marke, that though I had not on argumēt, yet my ſenſe beeing agreable to the wordes of the Pſal. and conſonant to the ſcriptures, is inough of it ſelf, to prove that youres is not the proper meaning of theſe words. But ſay you, this cannot be the graue, becauſe it followeth they ſhall be the porcion of Foxes; that is, they ſhall want the honour of the grave, and there you ſet *Calvine* againſt mee, ſaying, that you ſee not how we may be reconciled togither. For my part, I care no more for *Calvines* fauour, then *Auguſtines* and other godly mens, that haue laboured fruitefully in the Lordes harueſt, whatſoeuer it pleaſeth you to beare your reader in hand otherwais of me. But if you had ben half ſo lerned as you think your ſelf: or half ſo indifferent as men do wiſh, that wiſh you well, you might haue ſeen that the graue is vſed by a *Metonymia* for all the dead, whether layd vp in the bowels of the earth, or floting in the ſea, or deuoured of rauenous beaſts. For the Hebrue SHEOL doth not ſo much ſignifie the graue (which for want an other word we are forced to ſet for it by a *Metonymia*) as that which the greeke ἅδης, doeth better expreſſe by the privation of light or life, ſeparating all the dead, which in Latine be called *inferi*, and *manes*,

from

from the living, which they call *superstites*. And not compryſing onelie them which are buried in a graue as you do ignorantly ſuppoſe heere, nor the damned as you do as wiſelie hold in another place. Thus the very heathens did vſe this word, πολλα δ' φ'ιθιμους ψυχας αιδι προιαψεν ἡρωων ſaith *Homer*: that is, hee ſent manie worthie ſoules (not to the hell of tormentes, that had beene a bad rewarde for their worthineſſe) but to the dead, or to the graue. So is the ſame word vſed by *Nonnus*, a Chriſtian Poet of great antiquitie, in his Paraphraſe vpon Iohn, cap 11. ſpeaking of *Lazarus*, who you will not ſaye, (I hope) was in Hell. και εν φθιμενοισιν ακουασας εξ αιδος νοστησε φυγας νεκυς: that is, and hearing amongſt them that were dead & rotten, the fugitiue corps returned again out of hel. The ſame authour in the ſame place vſeth ερεβθεν in the ſame ſignification, whence the Latines haue borrowed their *Barathrum*. νεκρον αγειρας λαζαρον αχλυοεντος αναθρωσκοντα ερεβθεν νοσιμον εκ νεκυων. That is, who raiſed vp the dead *Lazarus*, skipping out of the ſmokie gulfe, and returning from the dead. So the Latines vſed their *Orcus* and *Tartarus*, not deuiding the damned and the ſaued: but the dead and the living, by the priuation and habit of light and ſeeing. Wher you aske mee why Dauid ſhould ſpeake of their temporall death, which is common to all, I tolde you (if you will be tolde it) to ſolace himſelf by the remembrance of their malice, that it was not euerlaſting, but ſhould ceaſe with their ſhort liues. You conclude this ſection with a new ſyllogiſme, with proteſtation to good *M. Hume* (ſo you call him) to anſwere it plainelie. The lower partes of the earth, ſignifie not the graue, but hell. Chriſt deſcended into the lower parts of the earth. *Ergo*, Chriſt diſcended into Hell. Now, *M. Hume* to deſerue your good name, firſt, denies the *maior*: ſecondlie, he replyes to the *minor*, that

in his judgement, the lowermoſt partes of the earth that Chriſt deſcended into, may wel be taken for the baſe and meane eſtate that the ſonne of God diſcended into vpon the earth. The ſonne of a Carpentar, borne in a ſtable, cradled in a cratch, and living in a baſe eſtate, without a hole to hide his head in, was even the loweſt and baſeſt partes of the earth. Hee could not well goe lower. Thus *Hume* bids you goe your way, and take this for an anſwere.

HVME *Sect.* 9.

YOur other places be, *I wil pearce through all the lowermoſt partes of the earth, and looke on them that bee aſleepe.* Eccleſ. 24. *And they ſhall be caſt downe into the lowermoſt parts of the earth, and ſleep in the middeſt of the vncircumciſed.* Ezech. 31. 18. which two places, by your leaue, cannot be well meant of Hel. Except that you can perſwade vs, that there is ſleepe, that is, reſt and quietnes in Hell, but of the graue and ſtate of the dead, whereof wee haue as commonlie almoſte, as ſtones in the ſtreete, *he did ſleepe with his Fathers.* The ſame wordes ERETS TACHTITH, which you ſay, doth ſignifie properlie Hell, be ſo vſed by the Prophet David, Pſal. 139. 14. That they can no wiſe bee taken in that ſignification, except it can be proued, that Dauid was faſhioned and made in Hell. His wordes bee theſe: *My bones are not hid from thee, though I was made in a ſecrete place, and faſhioned beneath in the earth.* Here *Beza* doeth well obſerue, that the place of the Apoſtle which you alledge, may fitlie bee applied to the ſenſe of this place: and note vnto vs the diſcenſe of Chriſt, into the wombe of the Virgine.

Hil *his Reply.*

FIrſt you ſay, the place quoted by me Syrac. 24. 37 maketh not for the proofe of my aſſertion. 269 If you had conſidered what 270 went before, and what followeth, you wold haue bin of another mind. For before in the 8. verſe is ſaide, I alone haue 271 gon round about al the compas of heauen, and haue walked in the bottome of the depth. Which depth 272 Pellicanus alearned writer doth interpret *abyſſum mortis & inferorum*, the 273 depth of death and hel. Yea, the 274 whole Chapter ſpeaketh of the Sonne of God, and of his 275 wondrous workes in ſauing mankinde: of the which this is on, 279 that he was not only aliue among the liuing, but after death 277 his bodye was among the dead bodyes, 278 and his ſoule among the ſoules in hell. 279 which hee calleth the lower parts. The like ſcripture to this is in Iob. 38. 16, 17. 280 Haſt thou entered into the bottom of the ſea? or haſt thou walked to ſeeke out the depth; haue the gates of death bin opened vnto thee? or haſt thou ſeene the gates of the ſhadowe of death. 281 Theſe words are thus opened by Martin Borrhauius in his learned Commentaries vpon Iob. 282 I haue dwelled in the higheſt places, and my throne is in the pillar of the cloudes: I haue gone rounde about the compaſſe of heauen aboue, and by

The Paralogiſmes in the D. reply.

269. If you had red Chytreus, a man (as you alledg on your owne ſide) you culd neuer haue hoped that anie thing in this cap. wold haue chãged my minde

270. It wil not follow becaus he ſpeaketh of the bottom of the depth in the 8. verſe: therefore the lowermoſt parts of the earth muſt needes be hel in the 24. verſ.

271. This may be vnderſtood of wiſdome, which diſcouring by reaſon of all the

works of nature, doth after a ſort walke about the heauens, and vnder the bottomes of the ſea. 272. When al is done, Pellic. muſt hew this chip for this chinke. 273. Whẽ Pelican hath done with it, M.D. muſt turn *inferi* to his byaſſe, or els this labor is loſt *inferi* may be taken for the dead, as ſaid is in the former ſect. 274. That is doubted. 275. That is not true. 276. That is fals. 277. That wanteth probabilitie. 278. And that all ſhew of truth: There is not one word in all this cap. of anie of theſe things. 279 This is *petitio principij*. 280. In this place, God openeth to Iob the imperfection of mans knowledge. How can you make that liable to your queſtion, to proue that in the 24. of Eccl. the lowermoſt parts of the earth is hell. 281. Some bodie muſt helpe you. 282. How helps that you.

haue walked in the flouds of ꝑ sea. Ipearce through all the lower parts of the earth. Haue those in hell or the dead bin searched out of thee? ¶ dost thou knowe their estate and condicion, and what shall happen to their bodyes hereafter? and what doth happen to their soules now? The force of death and of hell hee maketh manifest by the names of gates, as it is manifest in that scripture: and the gates of hell shall not prevaile against thee. 283 By these words it is euident, that the nethermoste partes of the earth, Syrac. 24,37. and *Zalmaueth* the Hebrue word, Iob. 38, 17. doo signifie hell, and that none 284 but the Sonne of God aboue, hath personaly shewed himself in all these places. For the place in Ezechiel, that it maketh most significantly for my purpose, 285 I wil proue it by Esay, Ezech, and diuers other, both learned ¶ modest writers. Esay 14, 9. handling the same matter, saith 286 Hel beneth is moued for thee to meet thee at thy comming. 287 And Ezechiel in the 15. and 16. verses calleth it hell plainly. 288 Sith then both the prophets call it hell, how dare you to interpret the graue: that the nethermost parts of the earth do signifie hell, 289 I prooue it out of the 12. ver. of Ezechiel. And the strangers haue destroyed him euen the terrible nations, and they haue left him vp on the montaines, and in all the vallies his branches are broken. 290 Munster on this place saith, that by the branches are vnderstoode the carcasses of his hoast, which the beasts of the field did deuour. Lauaterus the Minister of Tigurin agreeth with him. 291 All the beasts of the field shall dwell vpon his ruine: the kings carkas shall not be laide vp into the sepulcher of his elders, but shall be a pray to crowes, griphins, and other carniuorous birdes. So doth Pellican a learned Linguist interpret this place, at the

283. How so: he speaketh not heere of that place.
284. Neither of these places signifieth the sonne of God.
285. Indeede Esay & Ezech were learned in a strange kind of knowledge.
286. The word in Esay, is SHEOL. not hell.
287. And in Ezech. also: & therefore this is a plaine
288. Sith the word in both the prophets is Sheol: & it is confessed that Sheol doth signifie the graue as well as hell, I wonder that you blush not to finde this fault with me.
289. You promise proof by Ezech, and flee to Munster.
290. You promise it by Munster, and flie to your own glose on him: & so you flee from bush to bush.
291. But he wil not help you without a glose.

laſte, there is ane auerſion or Apoſtrophe, to Pharao himſelfe, or to the Aſſyrian King. To whom art thou liknèd, O thou noble and high among the trees of pleaſure, thou haſt paſſed all other in power, and yet with other kings that were in thy company 292 they were brought to the loweſt parts of the earth, 293 (that is) to hell, among the abhominable heathen ſhalt thou ſleepe, and lye as a wretched and miſerable man. Now becauſe you tak holde of the word ſleepe, 294 you muſt remember that theſe words ar ſpoken ironically, 295 as it is noted in the contents of Eſay 14. The deriſion of the king of Babilon. Moreouer, Lauaterus on this place of Ezech. ſaith: These things may be better underſtood out of the 14. of Eſ. which prophecying of the deſtructiõ of ỳ king of Babilon Baltaſſar, deſcribeth with what bitter ſcoffs he is entertained 296 in hell. To end. Lauaterus on this place, proueth theſe four things: firſt, that there is ane hell: ſecondly, that hel in this chapter is called by three names, that is, 1. SHEOL 2. ERETS TACHTITH, 3. BOR. Hell, the loweſt parts of the earth, 297 and a pit: thirdlie, that this Hel is beneath vs: and laſtlie, that the tyrants and wicked of the world do diſcend into it, and this he proueth out of Numb. 16. 33. Pſal. 55. 15. And addeth alſo, that Tertullian and Ierome doo proue hel to be beneath in the earth. The concluſion then is thus, for as much then as the Aſſyrians dyed with the ſword, and were deuoured of the beaſts and birds of the fields, 298 I pray tell mee, how that can bee true that you affirme, that the loweſt partes of the earth doth ſignifye the graue: 299 for howe were they in the graue ỳ were neuer buryed? 300 therfore, they were in hel, as both Eſay and Ezechiel doo affirme, and as Pellican, Munſter,

292, It ſhould ſeeme to be (thou waſt brought) by the words before & after,

293, I can not finde Pelican, but if I coulde I beleeue I ſhould finde this *parẽtheſis* of your owne making: and if it be his, if you take hell for the ſtate of the dead, he hath not cut his cloake for your ſhoulders

294, I muſt know before I can remẽber it: & you muſt proue it if you can

295, There is noted a *Sarcaſmus*, & not *ironia*

296, He meanes amongeſt the dead,

297 Heer trãſlating Lauater, you make him giue Hell a name, which in the former ſect, you ſcorned as not be

ſeeming your owne learned lips, 298, By a *metonymia*, is that ſo ſtrange to you, 299 A tautologie. 300, An other tautologie, yet not proued,

& Lauater, three notable lerned men in the holy tong doe interpret it. 301 I thinke your owne friends when they reade this, will confesse you, either to bee ignorant of the word of God, or els to wrest it contrary to the meaning of the holy ghost. Moreouer, where you mislike with me because I said, that ERETS TACHTITH, that is, the lowermost partes of the earth, doth signifye hell generally in the Hebrew toong, and you bring an instance out of the 139. Psal. and 14. verse, where you proue, that the lower parts of the earth doth signifie the mothers womb, & therefore it doth not signifie hell alwaies: this is a childish reason. In a metaphorical signification it signifieth the mothers womb: 302 therefore in his proper signification, it can not signifie hell. 303 *Argumentum a metaphora ductum non valet*, an argument drawen from a metaphore is of no force. And that heere is a metaphor, M. Caluin shall be the iudge. He compareth (saith Caluin) the mothers wombe to the 304 lowest and inward dens of the earth: and a little after, for no doubt Dauid would expres metaphorically, that inestimable cunning which appereth in the figure of mans body. 305 The mothers womb is compared to hel for the darknes of it: for as Caluin saith, that artificer which maketh a cunning peece of worke in a darke place, is more to be commended then hee which doth the like in the light. Dauid also is heere saide to bee made in the nethermost parts of the earth, 336 because he was by nature the child of wrath and of hell, if he had not bin deliuered therehence by Iesus Christ. Breefely, where you say, that he descended in to the Virgins wombe, and that it is the true meaning of the place Eph. 4. 9. both you and your M. Beza are deceaued. For Paul reproueth you Ep, 4. 10. He that descended is even the same 307 that ascended. Now the body and soul of Christ ascended into heauen, therefore the

308

301, My frieds I hope will be better aduised
302, You alter the question,
303. Some arguments a *metaphora* may be better then anie you haue made in all this booke,
304, Then not to hell,
305, This is patched in amongst Cal. words, to deceaue the simple
306, This wod if it were brought to the Logicians frame will warp, and will neuer come within the mould of mood & figur
307. A paralogisme in the word the same

308 body and ſoule of Chriſt deſcended into the virgins wombe, if the body did deſcend into the virgins womb, then Chriſt took not fleſh of the virgin. 309 Thus that you may contradict me, you are not afraid ignorantly or wittingly, to deny the incarnation of our Sauiour: 310 Theophilact ſaith well of theſe words, when you read, that the Sonne of man came down from heauen, you may not think that his fleſh came down frō heauen, for this is ỹ opinion of Heretiques, which did teach that Chriſt brought his body from heauen, and did paſſe through the virgin, I hope you holde not this opinion, 311 but if you hold this interpretation you muſt needs fall into it, For he that deſcended is euen the ſame that aſcended. Eph. 4. 10.

308. It followeth not ſe the anſwere.

309. Vntruth.

310. A ſuperfluous allegation to proue a thing not denied: that is our old skil.

311. They of whom I learned this interpretation, looked as wel about them to miſſe ſuch myrres as euer you did or cā.

Violence in this ſection done to the text, by the Doctor.

Firſt, that the whole 24. chap. of Eccleſ. ſpeaketh of the Sonne of God, and of his wonderfull workes in ſaving mankinde: of the which this was one, that he was not onelie aliue amongſt the living: but after death his bodie was amongeſt the dead bodies, and his ſoule amongſt the ſoules in Hell, &c.

That Eſay in 14. 9. and Ezech. in the 15. verſe of his 31. cap. calleth that Hel plainelie, which Ezech. in the 18. verſe of the ſame chapter, calleth the lowermoſt partes of the earth.

That in the 31. 18. verſ. of Ezech. Thou ſhalt bee caſt downe in the lowermoſt parts of the earth, and ſleepe in the middeſt of the vncircumciſed: the word (ſleepe) is taken ironicallie.

That in Eph. 4. it is ment, that Chriſt deſcended in ſoule and body, as he aſcended in ſoule and body.

A new rule in Logick, that *argumentum a Metaphora ſumptum, non valet.*

The

HVME *his reioynder to the 9. ſect.*

FIrſt marke, that by a general axiome, whatſoeuer a man alledgeth to proue a thing, either doutfull or vnknowne: the ſame muſt be better knowne, and inforce ſuch a neceſsitie of conſequence, as cannot be denied. The thing that you haue heere in hand to proue, is, that (the lowermoſt parts of the earth) is as proper and peculiar a name for the place of the damned, as Hell is in Engliſh. To proue this, your teſtimonies ſhould be without controulment. But are in deede ſo farre ſhort of that marke, that they are, (if not harder) altogether as hard and obſcure, as the place, that they are alleadged to illuſtrate. The firſt of them I haue diſpatched in the former ſection. The next is out of the 24. of Eccleſ. a booke not Canonicall, nor written in the tongue, whereon wee ſtand. In which reſpect, I might haue reiected it. But becaus one anſwere ſerued it, and your third place out of 31. 18. of Ezech. I joined them together. The firſte was, *I will pearce through the lowermoſt parts of the earth, and looke on them that bee a ſleepe.* The ſecond, *Thou ſhalt be caſt downe into the lowermoſt parts of the earth, and ſleep in the middeſt of the vncircumciſed.* To them thus I aunſwered. There is ſleep, that is reſt and quietneſſe, in the place called heere the lower-moſte partes of the earth: But there is no reſt nor quietneſſe in Hell, the place of the damned: *Ergo*, the place called heer the lowermoſt parts of the earth, is not Hell, the place of the damned. For the firſt of your places, you ſay nothing to this argument. For the ſecond, you ſay, that the word (ſleepe) is vſed Ironicallie, that is, in a ſcornfull and mocking manner, and a contrarie ſenſe For proof, (for want of text) you take vp the contēts of the 14. of Eſay: and *Lauater*, who ſaith, that *Baltaſar*

far was receaued amongest the deade: (for so is the true sense) with bitter scoffes. First, consider that the figure in the 14. of Esay, is a *sarcasmus*, not an *Ironia*, consisting of bitter words vsed in their vsual significations. Secondlie, that your authors are but mē. Thirdlie, that they say nothing of the word (sleepe) which Ezech. vseth. Lastlie, that you haue (sleep) manie hundreth times, attributed in the Scriptures to the dead: but neuer to the state of the damned, neither in jeast nor earnest. Whereupon thus I reason. We must not wring words out of jointe by an *Ironia*, except some necessarie inducement in the text, or absurditie in the letter lead vs thereto. But heere is neither inducement in the text, nor absurditie in the letter: *Ergo*, heere we must not wring this worde out of jointe in this text, and take it from the vsuall significations, in other places of the Scripture. This argument is so strong, and prevailed so much with other writers, that you cannot finde one to take your part in this mocke. If you could, we should haue his name, with the highest stiles of antiquitie, learning, and æstimation, that anie shewe coulde yeelde him. Whereas you can with no colour hyde this blot, in the 24. of Eccles. there you run another course, perswading mee, that if I had read that that goeth before, and commeth after, I would haue beene of another minde. And affirming, that the whole chapter speaketh of the Sonne of God, and his wonderfull workes in saving, &c. You are somewhat deceaued of mee. For I haue read the whole chapter, and more then that, haue considered the matter in it. The whole Chapter seemeth to mee a *Prosopopoia* of the Wisdome, which God in his worde, and the light of nature hath left vnto man: praising her selfe in the cougregation. That the authour speaketh onelie of that Wisdome, (except you will make him leaue his

Gen. 47. 30.
Math. 9. 24.
Mark. 5. 39.
1. King. 11. 43.
1. King. 2. 10.
Luk. 8. 52.
1. King. 15. 8.
1. King. 14. 20.
1. Cor. 7. 39.
1. King. 21. 54.

ground, and wander from his ſubject) it is plaine, by the 11. and 12. verſes: where ſhe ſaith of her ſelf, that he that made and created her, appointed her an habitation in Sion. Which cannot bee vnderſtood of the æternall Wiſdome of God, which was neither made, nor created, but begotten. Whereas ſhee ſaith in the ſixt verſe, that ſhe cauſeth the light that faileth not to riſe in the heauens, and covered the earth as a cloude. If you take light, for the knowledge of god the heauens for his church, and the earth for the reprobate, as they are in diuerſe places of the Scriptures, there is nothing in al this chapter, diſ-agreing with this ſubject. That ſhee proceedeth from the mouth of the moſt higheſt: that ſhe is the firſt-borne of all creatures: that ſhe was created from the beginning, and made before the worlde: and that ſhe ſhall neuer faile, may be well vnderſtood of the worde of God, which came from his own mouth, and ſhall not periſh one jot of it, though heauen and earth doeth paſſe. As for the 8. verſe, which you ſay woulde haue changed my minde, that ſhe alone hath gone about the compaſſe of the heavens, and walked in the bottome of the depth: I ſhould ſooner take it for naturall wiſedome, proceeding alſo from God; which taking viewe of all his creatures from the higheſt heauens, to the loweſt center of the earth, doeth after a ſort walke about them, and vnder them: then for the æternall wiſedom of God, with whom diuerſe things in this chapter, will in no wiſe agree. Thus I ſee, that there is no thing in this chap. to perſwade mee, that the wiſdome heere ſpoken of, is the Sonne of God. But ſuppoſe there were, yet heere is nothing to help your cauſe. You know that the generall queſtion betweene you and mee, is not of the ſonne of God: but of the ſonne of man, that is, of Chriſtes humanitie, whether it did deſcend into the locall Hel. Of him, I will

will ſtand to it to your face, that there is not one ſillable in all this chapter, neither of his bodie, nor of his ſoule, neither amongſt the liuing, nor amongeſt the dead, in the graue, nor in Hell. Wherfore,(howſoeuer I haue read this chap.) you haue read it more then well, that haue found matter in it, that no man (but you) euer ſaw in it. The particular queſtion in this part of the ſection, is whether the lower-moſte parts of the earth, in the 37. verſe of this Chap. doth ſignifie the Hel of the damned: to which this allegation, and the other out of Iob is ſo impertinent, that I wonder you could hope, that they woulde holde way. For, what maketh it to this queſtion, that the wiſdome of God doth compaſſe the heauens, and walke in the bottome of the depth: that it entreth into the bottome of the ſea, or hath ſeene the gates of death. You are neere be-ſtead, that are driuen ſo farre for reaſons. Thus much (though it be Apocryphall) for the place of Eccleſiaſtes. As for the other place of Ezechiell, before you came to the anſwere, which I haue ſet downe before for orders ſake: you endeuoured to proue by Eſay and Ezech. that it maketh for you, after your owne manner, which is, rather to trouble your aduerſarie with newe reaſons, then to anſwere them that are in hand. For your proof, you quote the 14. 9. of Eſay, and the 15. and 16. verſes of the ſame chapter of Ezechiell. Where you ſay, both the Prophetes call the place, into the which theſe Kings are caſte, moſt plainelie, Hel. And wondering at me, that I dare interprete it graue, you note in your margent, Hume diſagreeth with Eſay. Ezech, Munſter, Lauater, and Pelilcan. But heere M. D. I pray you let mee aske a queſtion. In what language wrote thoſe Prophetes? Was the verie word they vſed, hell? If not that, (as I think you will grãt) but the hebrew word SHEOL, which doth ſignifie the

graue, rather then Hell, why may I not take the one ſignification, as well as you the other. Thus with your bolde daring, you dare the ſimple, as men doe larkes. But heere, now knowe, (if you knowe it not) that I haue ſuch reaſons, not to take your ſignification of SHEOL heere, as ſhoulde carie you as well as mee, if your wit were not maried to your wil. Firſt, though the *Aſſyrians* and *Babilonians*, of whome the Prophetes ſpeak in theſe places, were heathens, and damnable miſcreants: yet it was not their purpoſe to ſpeake heere of their æternall damnation: but of the diſhonorable deſtruction of their temporal kingdomes. Secondlie, that which Eſay in the 9. verſ. calleth Hell: he calleth four times the graue, and twiſe the pit, in the ſame chap. Thirdlie, in the ſame ver. which you quote, hee ſaieth, that hell raiſing vp the dead, even all the Princes of the earth, did meete the king of Babell. But all the dead, euen the Princes of the earth, were not in the Hell of the dãned. Fourthlie, in the 11. ver. he calleth the place into the which the King of Babell was brought, the graue: with wormes vnder, and ouer him. But that cannot be the place of the damned: *Ergo*, the place, of which he ſpeketh heere, cannot be the place of the damned. Fiftlie, in the 15. and 16. verſes hee ſaieth, When hee was brought downe to the graue, to the ſides of the pit, they that ſawe him ſhoulde ſay, is this hee that made the earth to tremble? But men coulde not ſee and looke into his falling into the place of the damned: *Ergo*, the place whereof he there ſpeaketh, is not the place of the damned. Thus much for Eſay. For Ezechiel. Firſt, in the 14. verſe, he joyneth the lowermoſte parts of the earth, with them that goe downe into the pit: and in the 16. verſe, hee joineth the going to hell, with the ſame. But to deſcend into the pit is to goe downe into the graue, not into hell: *Ergo*, both

both the lower-moſt partes of the earth, and SHEOL, heere is taken for the graue. Secondlie, in the ſame 14. verſe, the nether partes of the earth, is the pit and place of death, common to all the children of men: But the pit and place of death, common to all men, is not the place of the damned: *Ergo*, the lower-moſt partes of the earth, is not heere the place of the damned. Thirdlie, in the 16. verſe, The Lord did make the nations of the earth to ſhake, at the ſound of his fall, when he did caſt him downe into Hell. But the nations of the earth, heard not, nor felt not his fall into the Hell of the damned: *Ergo*, this is not vnderſtood of the Hell of the damned. All theſe reaſons had I, and they made mee dare to tranſlate SHEOL, (not the place of the damned) but graue. And therfore (M. Doctor) you may ceaſe to wonder at mee, if you will. And nowe I muſt wonder alſo at your manner of reaſoning. That the lower-moſte partes of the earth, doeth ſignifie Hell, (ſaye you) I will prooue it by the 12. verſe of the ſame Chap. of Ezech. And the ſtrangers haue deſtroyed him, euen the terrible nations, &c. Then, not finding your purpoſe there, you runne to Munſter, Lavater and Pellicane, that the King of Aſſhur was the prey of carnivorous byrds: and yet not finding to ſatisfie you, you wring out a conſequence, that if he was deuoured of beaſts, then he was not buried: if he was not buried, then hee was not in the graue: If he was not in the graue, then the lowermoſt parts of the earth wherin he was, muſt needs be Hell. Where I tell you, I muſt needs wonder, how you could leape ſo many ditches without a ſtaffe, to finde Hell in this verſe. For all the load you lay vpon me here of ignorance, & miſvſing the text: I did not take one ſuch leape in all my Letter. As for my inſtance out of the 139. pſalme, that SHEOL, doth not alwayes ſignifie Hell, but may ſig-

nifie the mothers wombe, you ſay it is a childiſh reaſon, & prooue it with a Catholik rule, that *Argumentum ductum à Metaphora non valet*. I knowe not what you mean by an argumēt, *à metaphora*. This is the firſt time that euer I hard *metaphora* ſuſpected to be a topick place: yet I haue heard good argumēts in metaphorical words. Chriſt himſelf, the beſt logician that euer I knew, had wont to make many ſuch. As for example. The ſeruant that putteth not his Lords talent to the vantage, ſhal be caſt into vtter darknes, where ſhalbe weping & gnaſhing of teeth. But al miniſters, that labour not faithfully in their charges are ſuch: *Ergo*, all miniſters that labor not faithfully in their charge, ſhal be caſt into vtter darknes, &c. I beleeue at the latter day, when arguments wil be as well ſifted, as euer they were in the ſchool-ſtreats at Oxen. this will be found a good argument, for all the *metaphora* that is in it. As for my argument, I ſee not how it is a *metaphora*. Though the ſignification of the word be metaphorical (as Caluin wel noteth:) yet it ſerueth my turne to prooue, that it is not alwayes Hell. And now you put me in minde of it, I will picke another argument out of the ſame place, that perhapps will trouble you worſe: That is, the naturall ſignification of euery worde, whence the metaphoricall is taken. But this ſignification of theſe wordes (the lowermoſt parts of the earth) is taken from the dennes and cauernes of the earth, as you note me out of Caluine. *Ergo*, the proper ſignification of this worde, is the dennes and cauernes of the earth and not Hell of the damned. Of this judgement is Mercerus, Cevalerus, and Cornelius Bertramus, in their additions to Pagnines Lexicon. You confute Beza and me, for applying theſe wordes to the place of the Epheſ. thus, He that deſcended, is euen the ſame that aſcended: But he aſcended in ſoule and bodie. *Ergo*, he deſcended in

ſoule

soule and bodie, which is not true of his descending into the virgins womb. And here you charge vs with ignoraunce, or wilfull denying the Incarnation of Christ. Good M.D. vse me as you wil, but be good to Beza: he hath bene well thought of as yet. I wonder, that seeing so much against him and me, you coulde not see the same against your self. You hold that this is ment of his descending into the local Hell: against which, thus I vse your owne reason: He that descended, is euen the same that ascended: But he ascended bodie & soule: *Ergo*, he descended into Hell bodie & soule: a thing that you haue not yet granted. Howe you will answere for your selfe, I leaue it to your self. I haue answered sect. 5. for Beza and me: see there. We denie not the incarnation of Christ, you purge vs your self within fiue lines. Wherfore you might haue let Theoph. alone, if you had no more skill to proue thinges not denyed, then the things in question and controuerted.

HVME *Sect.* 10.

BVt to let you alone with your Hebrewe, these wordes of the Apostle, can no wayes be taken for Hell, as you beare vs in hand: But doth purport the same that Iohn tolde vs in other wordes. *I came from my Father into the world, and again. I leaue the world, and go to my Father.* For, seeing the Apostle in this place bringeth his ascension, as an argument of his descending, which Iohn also did before him: *No man can ascend vp into heauen, but he that hath descended from heauen, the sonne of man which is in heauen.* It must follow by necessarie consequence, that he descended thither whence he ascended. Now I trust you will say, that he ascended into heauen, not from Hell, but from Bethanie in the sight of his Disciples. Secondlie, if the place where he descended, was heauen, Hel can-

Iohn. 16. 28.

Iohn 3. 13.

not be the place, whither hee descended. For if euer he was there, he went not thither in 30. yeares, after his descension and aboue. If you will say, that he first descended into the earth, and then into Hell: then that descending could not be one motion, beeing so manie yeares intermitted: but must needes bee two; first from heauen into the earth, and then from the earth into Hell.

H I L *his Reply.*

The Paralogismes in the D. reply.

312. You might rather haue dispared if the ignorance, or wilfulnes against conscience which you speak of, had not nestled in your own hat.

313. You must hedge mee in harder, before you make me take that mire

314. And you might finde if you know a good reason frō an ill, whē you meete it in the way.

315. It is neither first, last, nor anie reason at all, see the answere.

VVHere you say, you will let mee alone with my Hebrue words, & yet deny they signifie hel, I hope 312 because I haue proued, that they signifie not the graue (as you haue ignorātly or against your conscience affirmed) at your next answering; 313 you will say they signifie hell, and confesse your disagreement with Dauid, Esay, and Ezechiel. Now you conclude with certaine pregnant reasons as 314 you imagine: 315 your first is this: These words do purporte vnto vs, that which Iohn told vs in other words, I cam from my father into the world, and againe, I leaue the world and goe to my Father. Ioh. 16. 18. 316 This is nothing pertaning to the matter we haue in hand 317 vnles this be your argument. Christ came into the world, *ergo*, he went not into Hell. Heerof I thus argue. 318 Christ descended into the virgins wombe (as your selfe say) *ergo* he came not into the world. Or thus. Christ descended into the world, *ergo* he descended not into the graue. Christ was borne of the virgin, & came into the world to reconcile vs to his Father by his death, taking away our sinnes, and triumphing in his owne person ouer death and hell. 319 Therefore not only Christ came

316. A fig is not more lyke a fig, then this place is lyke the place, wee haue in hand. 317. My argument? that fooles bolt came neuer out of my quiuer. 318. It is no wonder to see as ill shapen reasons as these, come off your blockes.

came downe into the world, but as our body for sinne lyeth in the graue, so his body went into the graue: and because our soule was mancipate vnto hell, his soule went into hel, that by his discending our soules might bee freed from hell. In your next reason you say, that Christ descended thither, whence he ascended: now that is meerely false, as appeereth Math. 12. 40. For as Ionas was in the whales belly 3 dayes and 3. nights, so shall the Sonne of man be 3. daies and 3. nightes in the hart of the earth. Now Christ ascended from the superficies of the earth, but he descended into the hart of the earth. Therefore as this is no good argument, Christ ascended from the mount, *ergo* he ascended not from the graue, so this is also a weake argument. Christ ascended from the world, *ergo* he went not into hell: M. Hume lyeth in his bed, and early ariseth, afterward many seeing him he rideth towards Bromham, *ergo* M. Hume came from Bath and not from his bed. Then you adde this reason, if Christ descended into hell, then it was 30. yeeres after his birth, and so it was not one motion: you charge me with cloudes of sophistry, but heer is a thick mist of sophistications: what you meane by this motion, I know not but all the actions of our Sauiour are aptly deuided into humility and glory: of his humility there are 4. degrees. First he came into the virgins womb, secondly into the world: thirdly to the graue: fourthly, to hel. Of his glory and exaltation likewise there are foure degrees. First he came out of hell and the graue: secondly he conuersed in the earth: thirdly hee was carried in the aire in a cloud

320. How is this geare proued.

321. The figure of Ionas maketh nothing against mee, see the answere.

322. I did neuer spit such arguments: they dropped from your owne lips.

323. A sharpe frump: if you knew anie ill by Hume, I se you woulde barke with open mouth,

324. It is a weak eie, that cannot see the sunne through this mist: you are like him that could not see the wood for trees.

325 πλεριφραγον

326. By this distinction, he was not in the world, when he was in the Virgins wombe, nor when he was

M in the graue, nor when he was in hell. 327. That must bee one, whosoeuer be the other. 328. A degree is an ascense from one step to another. His conversing on the earth was no ascense: and therfore no degree at all. 329. This degree in the aire was not a step of his glorie, for he neither fastned his feete, nor made any abode there

cloud, and then entred the heauens with glory. Also where you say, that if hell were the place whyther he descended, it must needs be the place from whence he ascended. 330 This as I haue saide before is vtterly false, if you meane 331 the immediate place from whence he ascended, for it is known to all beleuers, that Christ did 332 descend into the graue, but he did not ascend immediatlye from the graue, 333 therefore your reason is against the Scripture. wher you make a distinction betwene the resurrection and the ascention: you may vnderstande if it please you, that Eph. 4. 9. The 334 word (ascend) containeth in it al ỹ degrees of Christs exaltation, & therfore the resurrection also: as the word descend doth comprehend all the degrees of Christs humilitie.

330. You say much, and proove little.

331. One ascension hath but one beginning called terminus a quo.

332. That pertaineth to his burial, nor the descending that Paule speaketh of in th is place.

333. Not, but such eies as yours.

334. *Petitio principij*, that is the place we stand vpon. It maketh nothing for you, except we will grant you your will without reason.

Hvmr *his Reioynder.*

IT is as easie to holde an Eele by the taile, as you to the question. The place whereon wee stand, is in the 4. 9. to the Ephes. *But that hee ascended, what is it, but that hee first descended into the lower-moste partes of the earth.* Which wordes, most of the learned, and many of your owne favorites, takes to be, as if he had said, that the Sonne of God cloathed in mans nature is ascended vp to heauen, what is it, but that the same Sonne of God, first came downe into the lower-most partes of the eatrh, and tooke on him mans nature: so that hee which descended, is euen the selfe same that is ascended to fulfill all things, and giueth nowe these gifts to men, to bee some Apostles, some Prophetes, some Evangelistes, &c. And so they take the lower-most parts of the earth not to be the center of the earth, in respect of his highest and extreame *super-*

perfoies: but the whole earth in respect of the heuens. Or, if you like not that (which notwithstanding is most receaued amongst the learned) the base estate that hee descended into, in respect of the high estate that he descended from. To ouerthrowe this interpretation, you alledge that the Hebrew wordes ERETS TACHTITH, is in that language the proper name of Hell. To proue it, you alledge the places which I haue confuted in the former 2. sectiõs. After which labour, I gathered some reasons from the infallible rules of nature, to proue, that this place cannot carie your sense. My grounds were, *Vnius motus vnum est principium, vnus finis.* And *contrariorum motuum, vnius res mouentis, principium vnius est finis alterius, & contra.* For example, East and West: South, and North: vp and downe, are contraries. If anie thing runne west-warde, and return east-ward: the furthest point that it runneth towards the west, is the beginning of the motion towards the east: or, if a man come down a high hill, and returne vp againe: The lowest steppe that he came downe, is the first step of his going vp. Whervpon thus I reasoned. The beginning of Christs ascending, was the end of his descending. But his ascending was from this earth, whereon we converse, *Ergo*, the end of this descending was onelie to this earth, whereon we conuerse, and not into hell, as you gather out of this place. My *maior* is proued by the second rule, because the mouer is one, Christ, & the motions contrarie, ascending and descending: The *minor* is proued Mark. 16. 19. Luke. 26. 51. Act. 1, 9. & by al the Symbols, or summes of our faith by the cõmon consent of all Divines, and the vsuall speach of all Christians, that euer was, or is. To this you answere, that the *maior* is vtterlie false, because Christ saith, Mat, 12. 40. *As Ionas was three dayes and three nights in the whales bellie: so the sonne of man must be three*

One motion hath but one beginning & one ending. Of contrarie motions (if the mouer be one) the beginning of the one, is the end of the other: and contrariwise the end of the one, is the beginning of the other.

dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth. Indeede, if the rule of nature were contrarie to this saying of Christ, I shoulde sooner yeelde, that nature might erre, then the Lord of nature lie. But Christ came neither to destroy the lawe giuen to his church, nor to the rest of his creatures, called the law of nature. Wherefore, this answere was not Doctor-like. If you had looked well about you, you might haue seene, that his beeing three daies, and three nights in the heart of the earth, pertaineth to his buriall, and not to his descending, more then his rysing again out of the hart of the earth, pertaineth to his ascension. For these are foure distinct things. His descending from heauen into his humane state: his burial, and laying vp in the heart of the earth after his death: his resurrection, and returning againe from the heart of the earth into the state he was separated from by death. his ascending from the earth vp into heauen. I drew also another reason from the first principle, to prevēt an answere, that his descending might haue beene first from heauen into his humane state, and then out of his humane state into hell. It was this: if Christs descending from heauen did end in Hell, then it culd not bee one motion, being so manie yeares intermitted, But it was but one motion: *Ergo*, it ended not in Hell. To this you answere, that I, who charge you with cloudes of Sophistrie, do raise such mistes of Sophistications, that you cannot see in them, what I mean by this one motion. But there is not the cause. That the Owle cānot see in the light, the fault is not in the light, but in the eie of the owle. There is not a gnetall in Oxenford, that had spent a moneth in reading *Aristotles* 5. and 6. bookes *de natura*, that would not haue knowne this argument. One descending, is but one motion. Paule speaketh heere but of one descension: *Ergo*, but of one motion. Your degrees of

humi-

humiliation, are heere impertinent. Howe properlie they are diſtinguiſhed, I referre it to the margent. You tell mee in the beginning, that my firſt reaſon was from the place of Iohn, *I came from my Father into the worlde*, &c. Now fillie man, I pitie your ſimplicitie. That is no reaſon at all. But ſeeing I was to apply naturall reaſon to this text: I brought that place to proue, that I made no priuate ſens of theſe words, Which courſe, if you would follow, your wrangling would ſoone weare to an end. But you ſay, that that place doeth little or nothing pertaine to this place, that heere wee haue in hand. A fig is not liker a fig then that is like this. That hee deſcended, and that he came from the Father: that he aſcended, and that hee went to his Father are ſo like, that though you put on your ſpectacles, you will not finde a haire betweene them. The argument that you frame heere for mee, and the two abſurd ſimilies framed on the ſame block, let them bee buried in the brain, that bred them. That is the fitteſt coffen, I know, for ſuch rotten ſtuffe. Wherefore, to conclude this diſputation about theſe wordes, ſeeing neither your examples in the former ſection, wil fit your hand, nor this place tolerate your abſurde ſenſe: I muſte put you in minde, of *Chippenhames* pulpite. There be manie godlie ſoules, that would be glad to ſee you ſo honeſt, as to performe the worde, that you paſſed there before them.

Hvmes *his* 11. *Seft.*

YOur next argument is taken from the wordes of our Saniour to *Marie Magdalene*, forbidding her to touche him, becauſe he had not yet bene with his Father. Whervpon you gather, ſeing the whole man is ſaid to be wher the ſoule is, that Chriſts ſoule

had not beene in heaven, becauſe he himſelf had not beene there. It is a wonder, if a man of your learning ſeeth not ſo manifeſt a fallacie. For, though by a figure a man may well ſay, that the whole is, where there is but a part: yet it followeth not where the whole is not, that there is no parte. An argument you knowe, *a toto diviſo ad negationem omnium partium*, was neuer current amongſt the learned. For example. The whole race of mankind is not in England: *Ergo*, there is no men there: Or, *Edmond Campion* hangeth not ouer New-gate: *Ergo*, no parte of him hangeth there. Like to this is your reaſon. The whole man Chriſt was not in heauen, *Ergo*, his ſoule was not there. That theſe wordes of Chriſt were meant of the whole, it is apparant by the text. For, that which had not yet been with his Father, was the ſame that *Marie* was forbid to touch. That I beleeue you will not ſay, was his ſoule, which is not ſubject to feeling, but the whole man conſiſting of ſoule & bodie. Wherefore it was the whole man that Chriſt tolde *Marie* was not with his Father.

Hil *his Reply.*

The paralogiſmes of this ſect

335. That note is againſt your ſelf, read and ſee.

336. That note ſheweth this place to be ſpoken of them that giueth bread to

My next place was not this, but a text out of Syrac. 17. 21. At the laſt ſhall he ariſe and reward them, and ſhall repay their reward upon their heads, and ſhall turne them into the lower partes of the earth. 335 In the margin is noted Math. 25. 35. 336 So that this place ſheweth that after iudgement, 337 the wicked ſhal be turned into the lower parts of the earth, that is hell. 338 This place, becauſe you not your 339 Synod can anſwere, you haue

the hungrie, drinke to the thirſtie, &c. 337. The verſe you referre vs to in Math. ſpeaketh of the mercifull, not of the wicked. 338. You are much deceaued. 339. What ſynode is that: I was neuer of anie ſynode, nor worthie to rule a ſynode.

haue passed it ouer and saide nothing to it, but are now com to your scholepoints, the which when I vse 340 you call sophistry: and so it were indeed if I did vse them 341 as you doe. You say an argument drawen negatiuely from the whole to the parts doth not hold. True it is if by (parts) you meane integral parts, 342 but not essentiall parts. My instance was thus, Math. 8, 11. Many shal come from the East and the West, and shal rest with Abraham, Isaac, & Iacob in the kingdom of heauen. Out of this place I proue that where the soule of man is after death, 343 there is the mā said to be, as we vsually say that these Patriarks and all the saints are in heauen, though their bodies be in the earth and are dust and ashes. If then the soule of Christ were in heauen vntill his resurrection, 344 then could not these words of Christ bee true, Iohn. 20. 17. Touch me not, for 345 I haue not yet ascended vnto my father, for it is the preter-perfect tense ἀναβέβηκα. Therefore as this is vntrue, to say that Abraham is not in heauen, 346 because his body was not in heauen: so this is false to say, 347 Christ was not in heauen, because his body was not in heauen. 348 Our body is gouerned by the soule, and man taketh his appellation of a reasonable creature not of the body but of the soule: 349 and therefore if Christs soule went vp to heauen as you say, this cannot be true (I haue not yet ascended to my father) Besides if Christs soule went first to heauen, and afterward his soule and body together, 350 then were there 2. ascensions: proue this, and I will geue you the goale. 351 You dally also with my argument in this manner, The whole race of mankind

340. Vntruth see the answere.
341. Words.
342. It is trew of all parts y can consiste after separatiō
343. But if you will proue the thing you vndertake to proue, you must proue, that wher the soule is not, the mā is not.
344. That followes not.
345. Heer M. D. will correct *magnificat* It is in the English Bibles, I am not yet ascended, and that he thinks not to be of the præter-perfect tense, and therefore he mends it, I haue not, &c. This had ben well found of a boy in his accidents: but a D. shuld haue knowne that *amatus sum* is the preter-

perfect time as well as *amatus fui*. 346. I know no man saith so. 347. Nor that, and (therfore) these two are παράγγελμα. 348. παράγγελον. 349. You had need of a cable to binde this therefore to the premisses. 350. It will not follow, see the answere. 351 I brought examples of my own general maximes: I dallied not with your argumēt.

is not in *England: ergo*, there is no men in *England*. 352 Do you think there is no more vnion betwixt Christ and his soule, then betweene all the men of the world? 353 then by this reason the body and the soule of Christ were neuer vnited together. Your next resemblance is this. Edmund Campions whole body is not ouer Newgate, *Ergo*, no part of him. 354 Heere is a soule error to thinke Christs soule to be 355 an integral 356 or diuisible part, which is ane essential or 357 indiuisible: for by your reason, 358 Christs soule is mortal, & may perish, as the integral parts of Campiō doth. 359 You vtter also an other error in these words (the whol man Christ) 360 for the whol man doth not make Christ, but God, and man as you may see in Athanasius Creede: 361 As the reasonable soule, and flesh is one man, so god and man is one Christ. I will ende therefore, with this saying of Irynæus who liued vnder Marcus Antonius in the yeare of our Lord god 125, which 362 thus proueth the descending of Christ into hell. For the writing against Heretiques, that said, hel, was in this world (as many doo now a dayes) thus reproueth them in his fist book and last chapter, 363 As Ionas taried in the whales belly three dayes and three nights, so shall the Sonne of man bee in the hart of the earth. And the Apostle saith, what is it that he ascended, but that he first descended into the lowest partes of the earth; and Dauid prophecying of this, sayd: Thou hast deliuered my soule from the nethermost hel: and rising again the third day, he sayd to Mary, which he sawe first, and worshipped him: Touch me not, for I

352. I neuer thought it, see the answere.

353. It will neuer follow by this reason,

354 That is a foule name.,

355. As good Logicians as D. Hill, Ramus and al his followers thinke the soule to be an integrall parte. *Partes integri sunt partes integrales, anima & corpus sunt partes integri scili cet hominis: Ergo anima & corpus sunt partes integrales hominis.*

356. I know not what you mean by a diuisible part. If a part, that may consist being deuided from the whole, I hope you will confesse the soule to be such.

357. This is a new terme of arte.

358. Not so, see the answere. 359. No errour at all, see the answere. 360. The man alone, you would say. 361. This proof needed not. 362. If you could follow the question, all the proofes in this section should bend to make your assertion good, that this saying of Christ to Marie, Ioh. 20. doth proue that his soule had not beene in heauen, when he was risen againe. 363 *Perge.*

I haue not yet assended to my Father, but go to my Disciples and tel them, I will go to my Father and to your Father. If then the Lord keep the law of the dead, that he might be the first begotten of the dead, how are they ashamed that say, hell is in this world. Thus you see it is no strange thing to see this scripture alleadged to proue that Christs soule was not in heauen, vntil his visible and glorious ascention. Irenæus a man of more learning and iudgement then I am of, alleaged it to the same end aboue 1300. years ago, and then it was accompted a currant argument among the learned. 364

364. By this it appeareth that Irenæus speakerh not of the hell of the damned, but of the state of the dead.

HVME *his reioynder to the* 11. *sect*

HEere before you will buckle with this section, you thrust for-ward your invincible *Goliah*, (as you suppose) and will haue him make an end of this battell. You say, that neither I, nor anie of my freends dare meet him. You thought so, because amongst all his fellowes, I mist him onelie. But you are deceaued of his valour. He hid himself amongst the slaine heapes of his fellowes. If I had seene his creast, I had seauen stones in a scrip, the least wherof was big inough, to beat his braine through his helmet. The place is in the 17. of Eccles. I neede not repeat the wordes. First, I could haue tolde you, that the booke is not Canonicall. Secondlie, that it was not written in the tongue, on the property whereof you build your argument. Thirdly, that these words (the lowermost parts of the earth) be not in the originall, wherein this book was first written: and therfore haue gotten Tom Drummes intertainment by the Geneua translatours, *Iunius*, *Vatablus* and divers others. Fourthlie, that though it had pleased Iesus the sonne of Syrach, to cal Hell by that name: it will

not follow, that all other men did vſe the worde ſo. Fiftly, that you could finde thoſe words in that ſenſe in ſome place of the Canonicall Scriptures (which indeede you cannot) it will not follow, that wherſoeuer wee meete with them, they muſt haue the ſame ſignification: except the neceſſarie circumſtances doe approue, or inforce it. Sixtlie, that ſeeing that place is ſpoken of the mercifull, & them whoſe good deedes the Lord doth keep, as the aple of his eie: it were a bad reward for men, whoſe good deedes are ſo precious in the Lordes eies, to beecaſten into the dungeon of Hell. Seventhlie and laſtlie, that ſeeing the common tranſlator, who foiſteth in thoſe words doth make it the reward of euery man, to be caſt into the lowermoſt parts of the earth: it wil paſſe your skill to proue, that euerie man ſhall be caſt into hel. The note in the margent of the 25.35. of Math. helpeth not you: but prooueth the contrarie, that this place pertaineth to them, that giue meat to the hungrie, drinke to the thirſtie, and clothes to the naked &c. Thus you may ſee, that this champion, is not ſo ſtrong as you take him, and that the note in the margent, whoſoeuer made it, helpeth you like ale in your ſhoes. You tell mee, that nowe I am come to my ſchoole-points, which in you I called Sophiſtrie. The true maximes and rules of art, ſucked out of the marrowes of nature, I neuer called Sophiſtrie in you nor no man elſe. Your ſhrimpiſh reaſons, ſet out in the painted coates of blaſed words, and confidentlie commended to the beholders, without al bounds of modeſtie: I haue called them, what I haue called them, and not ſo ill, as they deſerue. My rule which you ſay were ſophiſtrie, if you vſed it, as I doe, you confeſſe it to be true in integrall parts. Nowe ſay I, the ſoule and the bodie be integrall parts of a man: *Ergo*, by your owne confeſsion, my rule is true of the ſoule

Heer I follow Ramus.

soule and the bodie. But if you had taken my maxime right, you should haue found it hold in all parts whatsoeuer. For I meant that a particular negatiue of the whole, is not good to bring in a negatiue of anie particular part. All *Campion* hangeth, not ouer New-gate, importeth that some part of him, hãgeth there. And all men bee not in England, importeth that there be some men there: which bee particular negatiues, expressed in generall tearmes, as *non omnis* and *nonnullus* bee in Latine. Thus much for the aunswere, that you deale with. You left another answere which I will heere set against your argument in his best liuery. If the man is said to be (say you) wher the soule is, then where the man is not, the soule is not: But the man is saide to bee, where the soule is: *Ergo*, where the man is not, the soule is not. Firſt, (say I) the *maior* is not true. For though the man may bee said to bee where the soule is, by a *Synecdoche*: yet it will not follow, that where the man is not, the soule is not. Because this speach is simple, and that is figuratiue. In a good argument, the wordes must carie one face, not heere one, and there another. To examplifie this with your owne examples out of Math 8. Manie shall rest with Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob, in the kingdome of heauen. Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob are said to be in heauen by a figure, becaus their soules are there. But if you will take the words simplie, and conclude; becaus Abraham (that is the whole man) is not in heauen: therefore his soule is not there: euerie carter will finde the absurditie of your fallacie. This for my firſt reply. Now I add that you flee from the wordes of the text. For Christ said not to *Marie*, I haue not beene with my Father, but I am not yet ascended to my Father: which wordes will admit no forme to carie your conclusion, turne them, and winde them as you list. For the Scripture

denieth in plaine words, that the name of aſcenſion can be giuen to the ſoule. I hope you will grant that Dauids ſoule is in heauen: and yet of him it is ſaide, Act.2.34. David is not aſcended. This wypeth alſo away, your other obiection of two aſcenſions. For, that name was neuer yet giuen to a man, in reſpect of the ſoule. And therefore, I will haue the goale, though you ſtand in it. You wring out of my examples of the whole race of mankind, & *Campions* bodie, two abſurdities. The one, that I hold no greater vnion betweene Chriſts ſoule, and his bodie, then al the men in the world. The other, that I holde the ſoule of Chriſt, to bee mortall: becauſe I compare it to an integral part of *Campions* body. Why M. Doctor, haue you (now you are Doctored) forgot the olde ſpeach of the Schooles, when you were a generall? *Quæ comparantur in vno, non comparantur in omnibus?* Things cõpared in one thing, are not like in all things. You may bee like your Father, and yet perhappes your Father coulde not wrangle in this matter, like your ſelfe. And the Cuckow ſingeth onelie in the ſpring, like the Nightingall, though in melodie and variety of notes, there bee no likelie-hood at all. An argument taken indefinitly from the manhood of Chriſt to his ſoule and his bodie, parts thereof: is no better then from the race of mankinde, to euerie particular man, or from the bodie of the traitour *Campian*, to the parts thereof. And yet if you regarde the vnion of the ſoule & body, or the immortality of the ſoule: there is no more compariſon, then betweene your ſpirit and your Fathers, if it was righter, or the Cuckowes ſong and the Nightingals beeing far ſweeter. Laſtlie, you tel mee, that I vtter a great error in theſe wordes: the whole man Chriſt. Indeede, if I had ſaid man the whole Chriſt, I had perchance opened my head to this venew. But now I am faſter locked, then

that

that you can faſten anie blowes vpon mee, with the beſt weapons in your armorie. For ſeeing the worde of truth, doeth call Chriſt a man ſo manie times: I am perſwaded, it wil not proue ſo foule an errour to cal the whole man Chriſt, except you can proue that ſome part of him was Chriſt, and not the whole. The teſtimonie of *Athanaſius* to confute this errour, toucheth not mee. The concluſion out of *Irenæus* (though it might haue a favourable conſtruction) I leaue it amongſt the judgements of men, which you haue promiſed not to truſt, ſect. 3.

HVME *Sect.* 12.

NOwe let vs come to the great bulwark of your defenſe, which you made choiſe of to raze the whole worke vpon, I meane to bee the text of your ſermon. It is writteu in the firſt of Pet, 3. *That Chriſt was put to death in the fleſh, and was quickened in the ſpirit, By the which ſpirit, he went and preached to the ſpirites that are in priſon, and were diſobedients in the dayes of Noah,* &c Heere *Beza* whome we follow (becauſe he commeth neareſt to the true ſenſe of the Apoſtle) by this word Spirit, doth giue vs to vnderſtand the Deity of Chriſt following Iohn who called God a Spirit: and by this word (fleſh) his māhood: containing both his body and ſoule, as hee findeth it vſed of Paule: God was made manifeſt in the fleſhe. Which *Antitheſis* of the divine and humane nature, Paule doeth alſo expreſſe in the ſame wordes, which was made of the ſeede of Dauid according to the fleſhe: and declared mightelie to bee the ſonne of God, according to the Spirit. Where you ſee, that he vſeth the words no otherwiſe then he findeth them vſed in the Scriptures. Now, that this cānot be the ſenſe of them you reaſon thus First, ſay you this Participle πορευθεὶς, doeth ſignifie

ſome motion from ſome place,& can by no meanes agree with the diuine eſſence, which beeing at one time in all places, cānot at anie time leaue any place To this I anſwere: that it is ſpoken of the ſame ſpirit in the 18.of Gen. I will go downe and ſee, whether the Sodomites haue done according to the crie that is come vnto mee. And in Exod.3. I am come to deliuer them out of the hands of the Ægyptians. You can not bee ignorant M. Hill: that the ſpirit of God ſpeketh ſo manie times of the Deity by a figure,called *Anthropopatheia*, when God doth declare his preſence in one place more thē in another, by ſome notable effect. Which in this place was moſt neceſſary, to note vnto vs the cōtinual preſence of Chriſt in his church, departing (as it were) from all other places (which indeede hee cannot) and ſitting in it, as it were a continual ruler and moderator therof. Next, you alledge the other participle, ζωοποιηθεὶς (that is, quickened) that becauſe it is a paſsiue, it can not ſtand with the Deitie, which cannot ſuffer at al. This we denie not. For we attribute not this participle to the Deitie, but to the whole Chriſt, God and man. Neither doth the text ſay, that the ſpirit was quickned, but that Chriſt was quickened in the Spirit. Thirdlie, you tel mee that mortified and quickened are contraries, & both attributed to Chriſt at once, to note vnto vs, that he was both dead and aliue at one inſtant. Heere we confeſſe, that they be attributed to one Chriſt: but why they ſhold be referred to one time, wee ſee no reaſon to induce vs to think it. To this end you ad, that the Apoſtle doth ſhewe vs how he was dead, and how he was aliue, by adding dead fleſh, and quickened ſpirit. The verie text (as I take it) will denie you this: for it hath not, that the ſpirit was quickened, and the fleſhe killed: but that Chriſt was killed in the fleſhe, and quickened in the ſpirit:

ſpirit: which is all one, as if he had ſaid, that he ſuffered death as he was man, and ouercame death as he was God. And this Paull doeth ſpeake in other wordes, that he was crucified in his infirmities: yet liueth he through the power of God. Fourthlie, you ſay that the Scripture doeth ioine this his going and preaching, cloſe to his paſsion: As if it had ſaid: As ſoon as he had ſuffered, he went and preached. This (as if) includeth no neceſſarie matter. We expect demonſtration, and wil not be caried with (as) and (if) Fiftlie, you argue out of the 6. of Geneſis, that the preaching of *Noah*, is attributed to the third perſon of the Deitie, and not to the ſecond. The wordes be theſe, My Spirit ſhall not alwaies ſtriue with man, becauſe he is but fleſh. Which wordes fewe (or rather) no interpreters, that euer I ſaw, expound as you doe of the third perſon of the Deitie. *Tremelius* and *Iunius*, whoſe great paines, learning, and iudgement, all ſinceare hearts do reuerence, expound them thus. I will not long diſpute with my ſelf (ſaieth the Lorde) what to doe with theſe men: for my ſentence ſhall ſtand, that except they ſpedelie repent, I wil deſtroy them. Neither maketh it much againſt vs, though it were as you would haue it. For, ſeeing the actions of the Deitie are cõmon to all the three perſons, he erreth not that giueth thẽ to any of the three. So doth the ſcripturs in many places attribute the reſurrectiõ of Chriſt, ſometimes to the Father, ſomtimes to the ſonne, and ſometimes to the Spirit of ſanctification. And Chriſt himſelfe telleth vs, that whatſoeuer the Father doth, the ſame he doeth alſo. After this you obiect that ἀπειθήσασι ποτε, that is, diſobedient, & ſome-time, doth ſeparate the time of their diſobedience, and his preaching. But heere I muſt put you in minde, that πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν and ἀπειθήσασι, that is, went diſobedient & preached, be all of one tenſe

in

in the Greeke, and muſt needes be referred to one time, ſo that hee went, and preached to them euen then, when they were diſobedient. And this the word (diſobedient) doth confirme. For, to whome I pray you, were they diſobedient? but to the ſpirit that preached to them. As for the adverbe (ſometime) it is not ſet heere to ſeparate words of one time: but to diſtinguiſh the time of their inpriſonment, which was preſent, from the daies of their rebellion, which was paſt in the dayes of *Noah*, when the long patiẽce of the Lord, exſpected their amendement. Whereas you argue, that this cannot bee ſpoken of *Noah* his preaching, becauſe he preached to men, and not to Spirits: I am perſwaded that no man can preache to men, and not to their Spirites: becauſe hee that teacheth a man, inſtructeth his Spirit, which is his reaſonable ſoule. And yet heere you may marke (if it pleaſe you) that there be two things heere ſpoken of, preching & priſon: the on pertayning to theſe ſpirits when they were men with ſpirits: the other now, that they are onelie ſpirits: and that therfore the Apoſtle did diſcreetlie chooſe the name ſpirit, which is common to both theſe tymes. Laſtlie, you charge this conſtruction with violẽce: for that we take the word (ſpirit) in one place, for the Deitie of Chriſt, and ſtreight way againe, for the ſpirits of men in priſon. I hope you will not denie, but that the word is vſuall in both ſignifications, & that it is no wrong, to giue words their own ſignifications, when the drifts and circumſtances of the place doth requyre them. Hitherto, I haue dealt with your objections againſt *Beza*. Nowe I will proue with vnfallible reaſons, that your ſenſe, cannot ſtand with this text. You take the word (fleſh) onlie for the bodie of Chriſt, which died and was buried: and the word (ſpirit) for his humane ſoule, which you beare vs in hand, did deſcend into hell,

hell, and did preach there to the soules that had ben disobedient, and rebellious in the dayes of *Noah*. If this your conceit shall go for current: that which the Apostle speaketh heere of Christ, may be verified as well of anie other man. For when we die, our soules die no more then his did. But let vs look a little nearer the matter. The spirit heere, (as it appeareth by the text) doeth signifie that which gaue life to that that was dead. That (I trust) was not his humane soule, but his deuine and heauenlie spirit. Thirdlie, in this Participle (mortified) is compriſed death, which giuen to Christ, is neuer taken in al the Scriptures, for the temporal death of his bodie onlie: but whatsoeuer Christ suffered, either in soule or bodie, for the redemption of our soules and our bodies, & doth compryse his whole pasion. Which, (if it bee true) then the word (flesh) must be the whole subject of all this pasion: that is, both his soule and body, or the whole man Christ. For hee suffered as well in soule for our soules, as in bodie for our bodies, or else he had beene but half a Redeemer. Fourthlie, seeing his bodie was quickned, that is, restored from the graue, as well as his soule from hell: If you take (spirit) heer for his humane soule: then shal you confound those things, that the Apostle doth distinguish attributing that to the soule alone, which is commō both to the soule and the bodie. Fiftlie, seing (quikned) is to receaue life, either which it neuer had, or els had lost: the soule cannot be said to be quickned becaus, it neuer lost life, after that it once liued with the bodie. Heere you tell vs, that quickened is to be deliuered from miseries and sorrowes. Howe the English word may be taken, I leaue it to the discretion of the discreete and indifferent reader: But sure I am, it will proue a hard thing to finde that signification, either in the Latine word *viuificari*, or the

greeke word *Zoopoiesthai*, which bee ſo mixed with life, that if they ſignifie deliuerie from miſeries, then life it ſelf muſt ſignifie miſeries and ſorrowes, which, (though they follow on it) are neuer ſignified by it. If this deuiſe may ſtand, you wil ouerthrow the *Antithesis* betweene dead and quickened. For, if quickned doth not ſignifie a reſtitution to life, what contrariety hath it with mortefied or dead, which ſignifieth the extinguiſhing of life. Sixtlie, (ſpirit) doeth heere ſignifie that, which was free from death, and the violence of his enemies: This (I hope) you will not ſay, was his humane ſoule, wherein hee ſuffered the death of the ſoule: that is, the torments of Hell, as well as in bodie, the death of the bodie. Seuinthlie, the ſoule of Chriſt could not preach, beeing deſtitute of a tongue, mouth, and other organes of neceſsitie required in that action. Eightlie, to what end ſhuld Chriſt preach to thoſe damned ſoules, who were paſt the frute of his preaching? that which you ſay, that he went to reproue them, is not liklie. For mẽ are reproued, either for amendement, or to take away excuſes, which to theſe was needleſſe, beeing paſt all remedie, and excuſe. Ninthlie, this preaching was then, when their diſ-obedience was reform-able, which was in the dayes of *Noah*, and neuer ſince. Add to theſe (if it pleaſe you,) that moſte infallible reaſon of *Bezaes*, taken from the drift and ſcope of the text: to whoſe notes I referre you, being not able to handle it ſo well, as hee hath done it himſelf.

Hill *his Reply.*

HEere you play the Captaine, and will beate down bulwarks, and therefore you ſhould haue theſe 4. properties in you: vertue, knowledge, authority and felicity, for the firſt two they are in you (God grant

365 grant you vse thē to his glory) but what authority you haue to interpret the word I know 366 not, therefore in this case (I 367 hope) you shall haue no felicitie. Where you say, that this word (spirit) doth signifie the deity: and this word (flesh) the humanity of Christ, and that there is an antithesis betwene the diuine & humane nature. I confesse ṕ (spirit) some time doeth signifie the Godhead, and (flesche) the humanity of Christ. But they doo not so signifie in this place: 368 as I proue by the circumstances of the text and the woords them selues. 369 For where you say θανατωθεὶς killed or put to death, 370 doth signifie the whole passion of Christ, 371 ζωοποιηθεὶς signifieth the resurrection of 372 Christ, that can not be: 373 for of the passion of Christ is mention made before in the same 18. verse, Christ suffered for vs, the just for the vnjust, to bring vs to God. Now after his sufferings ended, 374 as Peter saith, he was both killed and made aliue. 375 Now of his resurrection is mention made in the 21. verse, as of his ascention in the 22. verse. Therfore, seeing the sufferings of Christ are mentioned before: and his resurrection is namelye set downe after: 376 whereof can these woords be vnderstood, but of the seperation of the body and the soule, and of the state of them during their seperation, 377 for an antithesis as you

2 knowe

The Paralogismes in the D. reply.

365. Such a word out of your mouth, might haue lifted vp my hart: if you had not said section the 7. that I wanted either science or conscience or both: How-soeuer your wordes agree I hope I was the same, whē you wrot that & when you wrote this.

366. Then I will tell you. the same, that all Christians haue to know God, & defend his truth

367. If my cō-mission be warrantable this hope may hoppe.

368. Heere you promise to proue. 369. And heere you fall to confute. So soone you haue forgot your self. 370. You alter the conclusion: I said that the Scriptures neuer giueth death to Christ, but for his whole passion: which thing you should confute, if you could answere mee. 371. Still you change the question: though quickned went necessarilie before his resurrection, I neuer said, that it signifieth it. 372. I brought reason for the things I said: and you answere al, with that cannot be. 373. See the answere in the rejoynder. 374. If you can proue that Peter said so, I will proue that he was like an Irish man, that comming out of a battell, boasted that hee had killed fiue men in the seet, that wanted the heads before he came at them. 375. What then 376. Is there no thing els to apply these things to? or is no repetition tollerable? 377. How doth this (for) proue anie of these things that you haue said.

know is of contrary, or diuers things, as in this place you see, in killed and quickned.) now how both these were true at on time, 379 S. Peter doth shew, for at the 380 same time, he was dead as concerning his body, he was aliue in spirit, that is in soule: 381 for the soule seperate from the body, is aptly called a spirite. Eccle. 12. 7. And dust returne to earth as it was, and the spirite returne to God that gaue it. So is it taken, Heb. 12. 23. Act. 7. 49. and 382 so doth this word signifie in this place: 383 for Christ was not killed both in body and soule, but only in body and in flesh: 384 for if the soule of Christ had bene killed, then had it bene mortall. Therefore Athanasius, Epiphanius, and all the Fathers, which did confute the Heretiques called Damœrite and Appolinaris, which denyed Christ to haue a soule, do confute them by this place, proouing that his spirite was among the spirits, that his soule seperate from his body, 385 was among the soules seperat from their bodies. This interpretation, you 386 see is gathered out of Gods word, & is made more manifest by 387 the wordes following: τοις εν φυλακη πνευμασι πορευθεις εκηρυξεν, which we translate. In which sprite he went and preached to the 388 spirites in prison, 389 First you translate εν ω by the which. But in the 1. pet. 16. you do not so translate it, nor in the 2. Chap. and 12. ver. the same word εν τω are Eph. 1. 13. 2. 22. 5. 18. 390 and so could I cite at the least, an hundreth texts in the new Testament, where if you translat εν τω by the which, or by whome, you shall ouerthrow the meaning of the holy ghost. The next word construing, is po-

378 Betwene these two * markes ther is a most disordered *hyperbaton*, of manie wordes, & not two lines together directed to one purpose.

379. Peter sheweth not.

380. This is foisted in the text.

381. That proueth not that *spirit* is the soule heere.

382. You beg the question.

383. He suffered the death of both. You leaue the word of the text (mortified) and choses a word, that taketh away the duble death which he suffered this is pelting with the text.

384. True, but who saith so.

385. And wer all the soules

seperated from their bodies in the hell of the damned: that he could not bee amongst such soules but in hell. 386. Truelie, I see it not. 387. I see not that, neither. 388 τοις εν φυλακη implyeth the Participle ὢσι, & cannot stand without it. Wherfore if you had cast an eie that way, you would haue translated it, that nowe are in prison. 389. You dream, we translat it not (by the which) 390. And you did, you wold lose your labour.

περὶ θεὸς which as I haue saide before 391 so I a-
uouche still, is spoken not of the deity neuer in all the
Scriptures, 392 and therefore must needes be spo-
ken of the soul of Christ. To confute this, you alleadg
Gen. 18. 21. Exod. 3. 8. First, I must tell you these
bookes were written 393 in the Hebrewe tong and
not in the Greeke, I craued an instant out of the 394
new Testament. Secondly, in those places that you
haue named ye interpreters do trãslate *Iarad* by ye greek
word 395 καταβαίνω ἔρχομαι, not 396 ἔλθω, ἢ not by
πορεύομαι. And this I proue, Iohn, 16. 7. ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ
ἔλθω, ὁ παράκλητος οὐκ ἐλεύσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ
πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 397 For if I shall not depart
the comforter wil not come vnto you, but if I shal de-
part, I will send him vnto you. Heere you see when he
speketh of the descending of the deity, he vseth ye word
368 ἐλεύθω, but when he speaketh of the humanitie
πορεύθω. 399 And in the same chapter verse the 28.
ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐληλύθα εἰς τὸν κοσμον: πάλιν ἀ
φίημι τὸν κοσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. I came
out from the Father and cam into the world: againe,
I leaue the world, and goe to my father. 400 And
this propriетie of speach which the holy ghost vseth,
ought to be obserued. I confesse the scriptures vseth
the figure *Anthropopatheia* 401 but when God is said
to come downe, there is vsed the verb ἐλεύθω, or some
one of the foresaid, and when mention is made of
πορεύομαι, it is alwaies spoken of the humanitie 402

391. You said that no verb of motion could be giuẽ to the Deitie, fol. 31 pag. 2. That I hope you are gone from. Now you haue no reason, why this word cãnot pertaine to the Deitie, but because it cannot pertaine to the Deitie, which is as if a man would say, D. H. could not get a Bishoprick, because D. H. coulde not get a Bishopricke.

392. That is not of necessitie neither.

393. Are they the fitter for that, to speak improperlie of God.

394. Why mã, is the old testament Apo-

crypha with you: you are a nice man. 395. *Katabaino* and *erchomai* be verbs of mouõ, as well as *poreuomai*. 396. *Eltho* I neuer red nor you neither in the present tense. 397 How can this place proue that? Iohn translateth not IARAD heere. 398. *Eleutho* is out of vse. You shame your self. 399. This place proueth your translating of IARAD, as the other doth. And heere you may mark that *erchestai* is spoken of the manhood as well as *poreuesthai*, and so by your reason, *erchesthai* cannot pertaine to the Deitie, more then *poreuesthai*. 400. Proprietie of speach: allace fillie man, see the answer 401. A vaine dreame. 402. Doth anie of these places affirme your assertion?

as it is to be seen Luk.4.30.9.51.52.56.57.Luk.13.22.Ioh.8.1.And in this place of Peter, the last verse, is vsed the same word πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανον He went vp into heauen. 403 Therfore, if you can quote but one text in the new Testament, that πορευομαι is figuratiuely applied to the deitie, your interpretatiou may 404 seeme tolerable: but if you can not (as I knowe 405 it is impossible) then can you neuer proue your interpretation to 406 be agreeable to faith, because it is not agreable to ỳ word. But of the next word εκηρυξεν this I note: he that was killed 407 and quickned, did preach: but Christ was killed and quickned, *ergo*, Christ, & 408 not the deitie preched. He preched not vocally, for he was 409 killed, *ergo*, he preached 410 really in soule: for here is noted. First, who preached? Christ, To whom? to the spirits. Where? 411 in hell. When? 412 after his death, and before his resurrection. 413 This is the order of Peter, and of our Creede, which cannot bee by man ouerthrowen. The word πνευμασι, that is spirits also, is not as you take it, 414 for you say it signifieth the men in *Noahs* time, but you can not bring one scripture to proue it. 415 Therfore, I say as I said before, it signifieth soules seperated from the body. That my exposition is true, I haue proued by three Scriptures. Eccles. 12.7. 416 Heb.12.23, Act.7,59. Now, as mine is true, so will 417 I proue yours to be false & impossible by Christs owne words. Luke.24,59. where our Sauiour, to proue himselfe to bee noe ghoste, but to haue

403. I haue quoted 8. and could haue quoted 20. see the answere. But with what face can you challenge a place of me, that is so vsed, when you cā bring neither reason nor place to the contrarie 404. wil it but seem tollerable, when I haue done? then it is better alreadie, for now it is a known truth. 405. Your knowledge was but a gess, and I haue beguiled you. 406. I haue proued it both agreable and necessary which I needed not. I stand at defence. It was your part to proue, which you cannot do, if you had 7. wits as good as your owne. 407. Ware sheep, that is against the text: that wherein he was mortified preached not. 408. Christ, and not his Deitie? If I had saide so, you woulde haue exclaimed vpon ignorance. 409. I hope the soule wherin you say he preached, was not killed. 410 I neuer heard a reall sermon, without words. 411. That is out of the text. 412. So is that also *petitio principij* twise together. 413. You beg the question againe. 414 Where, when, and to whome said I so. 415. It followes not. 416. These scriptures proues it not. 417 You dreame, that is not mine.

haue a true body after his resurrection, thus reasoneth: Behold my hands & my feet, that I am the same handle me, for a spirit hath no flesh and bones as yee see me haue. This was Christs argument, I haue a body, therefore I am not a spirit, 418 and so I reason against you and your teachers. The men in *Noahs* time 419 had bodies, *ergo*, they could not be called spirits, 420 Euery boy can tel you in *Oxford*, that *substantia* is deuided into *corpus* and *spiritum*, and that one of these opposite *species* can not be affirmed of another. And therfore, to be short, when you can proue out of 421 the new Testament, that πορεύεσθαι that is, iourneying, is spoken figuratiuely of the deity, or *Pneuma* that is spirit, signifieth a man ὁ hath a body. 422 I will giue you the goale, but if you will runne on this course, vntill you haue proued 423 these 2. points (which you must doo, if you will haue me to recant) then take heede least you run your selfe out of breath. Lastly, the word *Phylake*, that is, prison, doth signify hel, as it is to be sene 424 Apoc. 20. 7. When a thousand yeeres shall be fulfilled, Satan shall be losed out of his prison. Thus thou seest (good reader) how 425 I haue proued my interpretatiõ out of the word of God for euery word, which 426 our aduersaries can not doo for their interpretation: therfore, thou maist 427 safely assure thy self, ours to be good and theirs to be false. And that this word prison doth signify hell, you may see *Epiphanius*, *Athanasius*, *Fulgentius centuria* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 14. Peter Martyr on the Crede Nowell in his Catechisme, Beacon in the sick mans salue, Crowley in his answer to the reasons of Pound the Papist: All these 428 old and new writers, haue al-

418. You fight with your own shadow.

419. That followes not A man may say as well D. Hill is a wrangling spirit, as he calleth his aduersaries phantasticall spirits fol. 24. of his sermon and yet both he and they haue bodies.

420. you should haue left this to the boyes in Oxford: it is heere a deformed patch

421. You do well to holde you in that corner, but I hope you will refuse not the Canonical scripture, for al this.

422. Then I see it bootles to hope for your promise.

423. A narrow shift.

424. The thing is true: your proof is naught like al

the rest. 425. Hand-somlie: in good sadnesse D. you cannot tell howe to settle your self to proue anie thing. 426. Blush for shame, se the answere 427. Vpon your vnsure gesse? he were mad then. 428. First you say that they take prison for hell: & you conclude, that they al alledge this place as you do: your pen runnes at random

alleadged this Scripture as I haue done, with good
429 warrant and conſcience. Now that I haue proued
this my owne interpretation, I will (by Gods
grace) proue your anſwere 430 to be friuolous. Firſt
you 431 confeſſe, that killed and quickned are Par-
ticiples of one tenſe, and yet you ſay, they are not
referred to Chriſt at one time, this is meerlye falſe,
as I thus proue: Chriſt was after his paſſion dead &
aliue, or neuer; if he were neuer dead and aliue at one
time, then 432 Peter ſaith not truly, if he were dead
and aliue at on time then you ſpeak falſly. Now you
433 your ſelfe confeſſed that he was dead and aliue
at on time alittle before, and proued it out of the 2.
Cor. 13.4. He was crucified concerning his infirmity,
yet liueth hee by the power of God. 434 Heere
by your own words, Chriſt was aliue when he was
435 crucified: ſo may 436 I ſay wᵗ Pet. he was aliue
when he was dead, & at one time, Then you ſay, the
(fleſh) ſignifieth the manhode, and (ſpirite) the deitye:
this alſo is vntrue, for the body may be 437 killed,
but the 438 ſoule can not. Again, ſhew me any Scrip
ture where 439 on and the ſam word in on ſentence
and period, is taken for diuers things: for in this ſen-
tence, In which ſpirite, hee went and preached to the
ſpirits that ar in priſon, Heer the word (ſpirit) in the
beginning of the ſentence ſignifieth the deity, in the
latter end, the ſame word ſignifieth the 440 men
that liued in Noahs time by your interpretation: but
by my interpretation, it ſignifieth the ſoule ſeperate
from the body in both places. For as Cirill ſaith, as
Chriſt was with the liuing in body and ſoule, ſo to
ſhew himſelfe a true man, his body was a mong the
dead bodies, and his ſoule among 441 the ſoules.
Then you auouch the preching of Noah is attributed
to

429. Their conſcience I hope, was better then their warrant
430. You haue promiſed that once already.
431. It was neuer denied: what needs a confeſſion in a known caſe
432. Now for your credites ſake, tell me wher Pet. ſaith that hee was dead & aliue at one time.
433. For ſham M.D. ſpeake truth.
434. A tautologie.
435. But not when he was dead.
436. You will ſay that with Peter, which Peter neuer ſaid.
437. This word expreſſeth not the Greeke *thanatotheis*.
438. And yet the whole mā may be mortified.

439. See the anſwere. 440. Not ſo, but the ſpirits that now are in priſon, 441. And ſo it was but not in hell

to the whole Trinity, be it so, but can you proue that Christ after he was killed did preach in Noah, for this 442 preaching was after Christs death, 443 which is mentioned in the 18. verse, and before his resurrection, which is spoken of in the 21. verse. If you goe forward and tell mee, that *pote*, doth not determine the participle *apeitheſaſi* that is, disobedient: but *ekeryxen* that is, preached. I must tell you plaine you 444 an Aduerb is some time put to a participle, as Math. 2. 7. *Tote erodes lathra kaleſas touſ magous*. Then Herod calling priuily the wise men. Sometime to a Noune 445 as *homo egregie impudens*. Sometime to an Aduerb as *parum honeſte ſe gerit*. Therefore the Aduerb *pote*, comming 446 after *apeitheſaſi*, next & immediatly, and being distinguished from *ekeryxen* by 447 a Comma, cannot by any example in diuinitye, or by any rule of Grammer be 448 coupled with the verb *ekeryxen* 449 Now to answer your infallible reasons. First you reason against me, that if my construction bee true, 450 then nothing did happen to Christ which might not be verified of any man. 451 And did you not blush whē you wrote these things? 452 Can any mans soule goe to hell, and returne againe? For his going downe to hell 453 I proue in the 19. verse, and his returning from 454 hell in the 21. verse: Secondly, you say the word spirit doth signifie that which gaue life, what then? as God giueth life to the body effectually, 455 so the soule giueth life to the body formally. 456 Your Geneua translation

442. How proue you that? 443. The death and resurrection of Christ, & his preaching in the dayes of Noah, ar heer mentioned 444 and as *obiter*, and as occasions led them in, & ex 445 presseth not the order, when they were done. If 446 this reasoning be good, the 447 passion in the beginning of the 4 cap. following the ascension, expressed in the last verse of the third. 448. But most commonlie with a verbe. 449. This is like *ſalue Domine*, I am glade to see you wel. 450. I said M.D. begins with greek cut of the new Testament and ends in latine out of the English accidents. 451. Euerie aduerb affecteth not the word it standeth by. 452. Put out that *comma*, it is an vsurper. 453. Nor separated from it. 454. That promise is twise made now. 455. That nothing is spoken of Christ in these words, (mortified in the flesh, & quickned in the spirit) which may not, &c. 456. Did you not blushe to rack my wordes to the while discourse, which are spoken but of one member. 452. No forsooth. 453. 454. those be without my bounds. 455. That is, the forme giueth the forme to the bodie. 456. Why mine more then yours.

O which

which you follow, saith hee, was quickned 457 in the spirite, not of the spirit. And this I note against your side, *en* 458 in the 18. verse you translate (In) But in the next verse, as though you had not done well in the former, you translate it 459 (by) Now you know the prepolition *dia*, signifieth (by) and not *en*, as it appereth in the 21. verse and in many places mo. 460 *dia anastaseos*, that is, by the resurrection. Moreouer, if you had said quickned 461 of the spirite, then had you made a probable answer: but no diuine is able to proue this exposition, that Christ was quickned in the spirit: that is, in the deity, for the deity is like it selfe. Your third pregnant reason is, that *thanatotheis*, signifieth not only the death of the body, but also the whole passion of Christ. 462 This can not be, for the 463 suffrings of Christ are set downe before in the same verse: then in this word, *thanatotheis* is shewed the maner of the death, that Christ suffered, that is, hee was 464 killed, and suffered a violent death. For *thanatotheis* being deriued of 465 *thanatos*, must 466 needs signifie put to death. Now I hope you wil not say, Christ was put to deth in 467 soul & body, but in body only. And wher you say, that Christ suffered in soule aswell as in body, that is true, & that is gathered 468 not of *thanatotheis* ỳ is killed, but out of these words antecedent (for Christ suffered the iust for the vniust,) 469 No reasonable man but hee will say, that the sufferings of Christ, are comprised rather in the word (suffered) then in ỳ word (killed.) To your 470 fourth reason I reply, that Christ was rayled from the dead, but it is specially signified in the word resurrection, ver 21. & 471 therfore I do not confound those things that are distinguished, but

457. So say we
458. *En* is not in that verse at all expressed.
459. You dreame.
460. You promise to proue that *en* signifieth not by, & proue that *dia* signifieth by: this is cõmon with you, & a cunning point.
461. You say it cannot bee so taken: and would that answere seme probable?
462. A flat negatiue, for an instance.
463. A tautologie.
464. I haue said that this worde fitteth not the greek
465. A Passiue participle frõ a verb actiue.
466. Why so?
467. But I will say he suffered death in soule and bodie.
468. But why not?

469. What reason should moue a reasonable man, to denie that Christ suffered the death of the soule. 470. This will not answere my reason. 471. A confused negatiue of confusion. Put your antecedents to this (therfore) if your skill can do so much.

but your selfe: 472 for you make suffered and killed all one, 473 and quickned and the resurrection all one, and so mak not only a confusion, but a tautology and needeleſſe repetition which neuer 474 was read in the word of God. To your fift argument, where you say, *zoopoieisthai* is to receaue life, I confesse it is to be made aliue. Then you vrge, it can not be spoken of ẏ soule which neuer lost life: Then by ẏ same reason more strongly, it can not be spoken of the 475 Godhead, which hath, doth, & shal liue for euer: for God cã not receaue life, but ẏ soule is said to liue, 476 when he is out of the body, not because he liued not before, but 477 because ẏ body doth hinder ẏ actions of the soule, Iohn. 11.25. 478 He that beleeueth in mee. though he were dead yet shall he liue. Sap. 9, 15. 479 The corruptible body is heavie vnto the soule, & the earthie mansion keepeth downe the minde that is full of cares. 2. Cor. 4, 16. 480 Therfore, we faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet our inward man is dayly renewed. Heere 481 Paul sayth, the weaker the body is, ẏ stronger is his soule, 482 therefore the death of the body is the life of the soule. To drawe to ane ende, your Antitheſis of the 483 Deuinitie & humanitie is answered before. For your Antitheſis must be of things contrary, or at the least diuers 484 and seperate, but as you affirme truly, the Godhead was never seperated from the humanitie: 485 therefore this antitheſis is of the body and soule, which at this time were deuided, and not betweene the deity and humanitie which were alwaies vnited: 486 wherfore, this bulwarke I can assure

472.473. where M.D? thé were I worthie to we are a bable A rogue burned in the ear suffereth, but is not killed.

474. Vntruth D. the scripture vseth ma nie tautologies to help our memories and vnderstanding: though this in mens writings be a fault, in scripturez it is most necessarie, that one place may help another.

475. This answere were somewhat if you could make it good that we giue this participle to the Deity.

476. The question is, whether the soule is quickened, or made to liue, when it is out of the

bodie. 477. *Non causa pro causa.* 478. 479. 480. These places proue not the question 481. Paull saith not so heere. 482. It followeth not. 483. The *Antitheſis* there expressed is between mortified and quickned. 484. But diuerse, but not alwaies separate. 485. This therefore is builded on the wrong side of the way. 486. You call it in your margent *fortiſſimum argumentum*, but it is a starued shrimpe. It cannot stand though it be not touched.

you will ſtand, and you haue ouerſhot both it, & your ſelf in attempting to ouerthrow it. For the very ſcope of the Apoſtle is this, all Chriſtians muſt ſuffer afflictions for well doing, for Chriſt did not only ſuffer both in body and ſoule, but alſo was put to a ſhamefull death in his body, 487 and in his ſoule went downe to the ſoules in 488 hell, which were vnbeleeuers in the dayes of Noah: but Chriſt did ariſe againe from hel, and the graue, and aſcended both in body & ſoule to heauen: therfore, thal you, that ſuffer for wel doing, be deliuered from death and hel by his merits, and goe vp into heauen, and be partakers of his glory, as you haue ben partakers of his affliction Moreouer, as you referre mee to reade Bezas greate notes one this text, ſo I pray you to reade Aretius handling this place, whoſe words ar theſe. Generally (ſayth Aretius) Pet. repeateth three effectes of Chriſts death, if you marke it wel. The firſt pertaineth to the damned, The ſecond to the elect. The third the perſon of Chriſt. The firſt was declared in his deſcending in to hell. The ſecond in his reſurrection. The third in his aſcention into heauen. This is the true and naturall meaning of this place which wee will follow, leauing the intrications of other interpretations. I willingly confeſſe this place is very hard, for Auguſtine doubteth of it, & Luther douteth of it how it is to bee vnderſtoode; but this obſcurity aryſeth not of the place, but of the varietie of interpretations, If thou marke the plainneſſe of the place, the matter will be eaſye, but that pleaſeth not all men: therefore that euery on may eſtablish his owne ſence, they apply the words of the Apoſtle Peter to their owne conceit. But leauing theſe, let vs imbrace that which the words do teach vs: in the which, if we attaine to the truth, it is well: if not, yet they ſhall bee probable, becauſe they haue warrant out of the ſcriptures, and

487. Be ſure that that be one.

488. That is out of the way: Chriſts going downe to hel is no perſuaſion for vs to ſuffer afflictions.

leaue

leane to the very letter *to reto*, otherwise it is certain, the knowledge of man to be vnperfect in many questions of holie scripture, of the which the Apostle doth warne vs, 1. Corin. 15. For now wee knowe vnperfectlie. I haue sayd here is declared three effects of Christs death which differ in time, & are set in order in the Creede. The first effect is, that Christ being dead, denounced eternal paines to the wicked in hell. The words of the Apostle are these. In which spirite he went and preached to the spirits detained in prison. I take the place simply of the descence into hell, for so the words do plainly sound, and I see al the Fathers so to interpret them: Augustine Epist. 99. and Ciprian doth manifestly interpret this place of the descending into hel. Neither doth the word prison hinder this Interpretation: which in the Apocal. 20. 5. is taken for hel. When a thousand yeers shal be fulfilled, Satan shall be losed out of his prison. Therefore, the prison that Peter heere speaketh of, is the place deputed to the damned. Hyther came Christ, as we confes in the Creede, He went downe into Hell. 489 where Hell is, it is a foolish & curious question to enquire, sith no man cõming to that place euer returned but only Christ. Furthermore, what Christ did there, Peter expresseth, he preached to the spirits, that is, he declared that he shewd himselfe manifestly to the world and made that dire and mornefull sermon, namely, to ỹ wicked, that the merit of his death did nothing pertaine vnto them, but by his presence were confirmed those punishments of the which Noah and other prophets had forwarned them. And the tyme of this Preaching, I referre not to the tymes of Noah, but to the tyme of hys descending into Hell. Whereunto agreeth the worde *pneumasi*, that is, spirits, for hee preached to the spirits, that is, to dead, and not to liuing men. Thus farre Aretius. 490 I could heere al-

489. But you make no dout but that hel is vnder the earth, in your sermon fol. 40 pag. 2. in print

490. You should waste winde, and break your promise.

alleage many other newe Writers, whiche are of my iudgement, but becauſe you peelde them no credite, therefore of purpoſe I will omit them.

Hvmi *his Reioynder to the* 12. *ſect.*

THis berrie is ſo confuſed, that I can not finde where to enter my firret. Firſt, I prooued that *Beza*, whome we follow in this place, doth no violence to the wordes: but vſeth them as hee findeth them vſed by Iohn, Paull, and Peter. Which foundation beeing laide, I anſwere your 10. reaſons, and put other 10. to the other ſcale, to counter-weigh them. You neither defend your owne, nor anſwere mine, in order as they ly: But like a mad Dog, ſnatch heere one, and there another, and let them goe, that you cannot bite. I cannot follow your ſteppes, they be ſo crooked. Wherefore, I will walke on my firſt ſteppes, and ſeeke your anſweres, where I can finde them. That which I ſay of the vſe of the words, you confeſſe, and diuers of my reaſons, you ſlip without an anſwere.

1. Reaſon. The firſt of my reaſons was from theſe wordes, (mortified in the fleſh, and quickened in the Spirit) Thus, If (fleſh) heere doth ſignifie the body, and (ſpirit) the humane ſoule: then nothing in theſe words is ſpokē of Chriſt, that may not be verified of other men. But in theſe words ſome ſingular matter is attributed to Chriſt, that other men are not capable of: For, we cannot ſay, that *Auguſtine*, *Ierome* or *Cyprian*, are mortified in the fleſh, and quickened in the ſpirit in that ſenſe, as it is heere ſpoken of Chriſt. *Ergo*, (fleſh) is not the bodie, and (ſpirit) the humane ſoule of Chriſt. That which you anſwere of his deſcēding into Hell, and returning thence, is not compriſed in theſe words, wheron my argument is builded, though

Anſwere. Reply.

though you gaue them your owne liverie, and cloathed them in your owne cullours.

The second was this. The Spirit heer doth signifie that, which gaue life to that which was dead. But the humane soul gaue not life to that that was dead, *Ergo*, the spirit doth not signifie the humane soule. Heere you denie the *maior*, and alleadge against the [redacted] which you call ours, and should bee yours as well as ours, if you and others of yo[redacted] highlie [redacted] tified in the (flesh, and qu[redacted] mortified as hee was man, and quickened as hee was God by himselfe. According to that of Iohn. I haue power to lay downe my life, and I haue power to take it vp againe. Take your note of (in) and (by) and make a wheele-barrow of it. But you moue me heere another question of some importance: and craue an instance (if I can) in all the Scripture. Howe one word in one period can carie two significations You are not (I hope) so verie an novice in Gods booke, as you make your selfe. Haue you not read, Let the dead, burie their dead: Or, labour not for the meat that perisheth, but the meate that lasteth, &c. Or, Who so will saue his life, shall lose it. Or *Abraham* rejoiced to see my day, and saw it. Or, God is a spirit, and will be worshipped in spirit, wher you haue the same word in both significations. O howe you would be-slouen mee, if you could finde such a hole in my hose! Now, I feare nothing, but that you craued an instance out of the olde Testament.

2. Reason. Answere. Reply. Iohn 10. 18. Math. 8. 22. Ioh. 6. 27. Mar. 8. 33 Ioh. 8. 55. Ioh. 4. 24.

The third was, If death, whensoeuer it is attributed to Christ in the Scriptures, compriseth the whole passion, the flesh in this text, must be the subject of the whole passion: that is, the whole manhoode of

3. Reason.

Christ. But deth is neuer attributed to christ, but for the whol passiō. *Ergo*, flesh must be the subject of the passion, that is, the whole manhood of Christ. Heer you denie the *minor*, and like a skilfull Logician, giue instance in the questiō. If you haue not forgot your oldelogicke, the argument, and the thing argued should not be one. You supplie the imperfection of this answere, with two arguments [redacted], that death in this place cannot signifie the passion. [redacted]. Your first reson is, that the passion is mentioned before in the word suffred, Be it so: Yet it may bee repeated in more speciall tearmes. By your reason, in the beleef, where a repetition is lesse tollerable, crucified and died, belong not to the passion, because they are expressed before in the word suffered. Suffering, which may be in torturing, whipping, and imprisonment, is too slacke a tearme, to expresse the hellish tormentes of Christs passion. The other is, if (mortified) pertaine to the soule, and bodie, it will followe, that the soule is also mortall. You tell mee out of *Athanasius* in the reply to my fift section, that by the double punishment inflicted on Adam, the soule should die the death. And I heard you preach in our Ladie Church at *Sarum*. That when it was saide to Adam, thou shalt die the death, the meaning was, he should die the death of soule and bodie. Now, if you wil apply these two significations of death to Christ: the one to the bodie, and the other to the soule: I hope this objection wil neither scratch nor byte.

My fourth reason was this. In this: *Antithesis* mortified in the flesh, and quickened in the spirite: mortified

fied belongeth not to the spirit, nor quickened to the flesh: but mortified belongs to the soule, for it died the death of the soule, and quickened to the [illegible] for it receaued life againe. *Ergo*, flesh is not the bodie onlie, and spirit the humane soule. To this you answere, that Christ was raised from the dead, and that was signified in the word resurrection, vers. 21. and therefore you do not confound these distinguished things, antitheticallie opposed. But wee, that make mortified, & suffered, quickned & resurrection all one. How this may answere mee, I leaue it to the head that bred it to explane. But you do vs wrõg, we make not mortified, & suffered one, &c. Suffered and quickned ar tearms more general, mortified & raised againe more speciall: expressing things more plainlie and particularlie, which were touched before more covertlie and generallie.

// bodye

My fift reason was. To be quickened is to receaue life, which the thing that is quickened either neuer had, or els had loste. But the soule had life in the bodie, and neuer died after: *Ergo*, the soule cannot bee quickened. To this you answere nothing: but tell vs by the same reason, it can much lesse pertaine to the Deitie. Thus, thinking to wound vs with our owne weapon, you strike short, and with the back, drawe blood at your owne brow. I told you in my answere to your second objection, that quickened is not heer attributed to the Deitie, but to the whole Christ, by the participatiõ of proprieties. How can you excuse your self heere of wilfull falsification? But you mend the matter, with a more sufficiẽt answere out of Ioh. That the soule of the beleeuer liueth, though hee were dead. What then? Iohn telleth not your tale, that the soule of the beleeuer, is quickened when hee is dead: That it liueth, is not the question. The burden of the bodie, which you alledge out of the book

5. Reason.

// died

Answere.

of Wisd. loadeth the soule, but killeth it not. And therfore, when it is deliuered of that load, it is not quickened, but releeued. And the renewing of the inward man, which you alleadge from Paule, quickneth not the soule, being dead: but addeth courage and comfort, to the liuing and languishing soule by Gods promises. Heere I see you are quite thrust frō your hold at Chippenham, that to bee quickned is, to bee deliuered from miseries. Ingenuitie woulde haue confessed a fault. You conclude with a confutatiō of the *Antitheſis*, between the divinity & humanity: but my reason is frō an *Antitheſis* between mortified & quickned, flesh & spirit: which you (by a corrupted glose) taking quickned for a deliuerie frō miries, did ouerthrow. Yet because I said that Paul maketh that *antitheſis*, Rom. 1. It shal not be impertinēt to view your reasons. An *Antitheſis* must be (say you) of things opposite and contrarie. I add, the Diuinitie and humanitie bee thinges opposite: *Ergo*, there may be an *Antitheſis* of the Diuinity, and the humanitie. But they are vnited, say you. What then? So be the flesh, and the spirit; and yet Christ saieth, the Spirit is readie, but the fleshe is weake. A common Logician, (much more a Doctor) should know, that no vniting of thinges, betweene which a difference may be obserued, can let an *Antitheſis*, if occasion serue. Notwithstanding the vniting, a man may wel say, Christ as hee was man, was passible, as hee was God, he was impassible.

Mat. 26. 41.

To these reasons, I added more in my latine which I sent you. The spirit heere doth signifie that, which his enemies, (hell & death,) could not touch: according to the text, he was quickened in the spirit. But his humane soule escaped not the violence of his enemies: *Ergo*, the word (spirit) heere doth not signifie his humane soule. To this you make no answere.

6. Reason.

The

The ſeaventh was. This ſpirit of which he ſpeaketh heere, did preach: But the humane ſoule cannot preach: *Ergo*, the ſpirit heere, is not the humane ſoule. To this you anſwere, that he preached not vocallie, but reallie, that is, not in words but in deeds. A dumb man may preach ſo, as well as D. Hill. If you ſtand 7. dayes in the pulpit of the great Church at Sarum, and ſay nothing: there bee not 7. men within 700. myles, that wil commend your ſermon. 7. Reaſon. Anſwere. Reply.

The eight was. Whoſoeuer doth preach, he doth it either to amend the enormities of the hearers: or to inſtruct them in the waye of ſaluation. But this was not to be hoped for in damned ſpirits: *Ergo*, hee preached not in Hell, to damned ſpirits. Heere you anſwere, that he preached to reproue them of their infidelitie: but you fall ſtill in one ditch. He that reproueth infidelitie, doeth it either to mend it, or to take away excuſes: But there was no ſuch hope in theſe, that were paſt all remedie and excuſe. 8. Reaſon. Anſwere Reply.

The ninth was. This preaching was, when the diſobedience of the hearers, was reforme-able. But this was onelie reforme-able in the dayes of Noah: *Ergo*, this preaching was not, but in the daies of Noah. This hath no anſwere. 9. Reaſon

The tenth was from the circumſtances of the text and neceſſarie *Analyſis* thereof: Which I remitted to *Beza*, who hath done that better, then I can, and whoſe notes, it is not likelie that you want, hauing ſuch a Librarie, as you ſpeake of ſect 7. You in the margent will mee to read *Aretius* and *Aleſius*. The one I haue read, and the other cannot moue mee, though hee be my countrie-man. I haue learned to preferre truth before men, what euer they be. Theſe were my reaſons, which I joined to the lawfull vſe of the words, proved by Iohn, Paul, and Peter. In them (ſo ouer-ſmoked is your ſenſe) you ſmell no reaſon 10. Reaſon

at all: But tell your reader that we cannot proue our interpretations by the Scriptures, as you do yours: and yet you bring nothing for your owne, but that the words may bee ſo taken: and a fewe ſillie conjectures anſwered before by mee. Nowe, having ſet downe mine, let mee ſee howe ſtoutlie you haue defended yours.

M. D. reaſons confuted, and his anſwere diſplayed.

THe firſt was. *Poreutheis*, (that is, went) doth ſignifie motion, from one place to another. But the Deitie cannot moue from anie place, being at al times, in all places: *Ergo*, *poreutheis*, is not attributed to the Deitie. To the *minor* of this argument, I aunſwered out of the 18. of Geneſis, and 3. of Exodus. That the God-head is ſaide to moone from place to place, by a figure called *Anthropopatheia*. You reply, that the bookes that I cite, are written in Hebrewe, And that the interpreters doe tranſlate that hebrew word by *katabainein* or *ercheſthai*, and not *poreueſthai*. As if the Hebrewe tongue, which is called *lingua ſancta*, were fitter to ſpeak improperly of God, then the Greeke, or that *poreueſthai*, had gotten ſome ſpeciall licence, more then anie other verbs of motion, to be free from that figure. Yet if it will pleaſe you to read Exod. 13. 2. Nomb. 14. 14. Deut. 1. 33. Exod. 33. 3. Pſal. 132. 8. Deut. 31. 3. Pſal. 71. 12, Pſal. 88. 7. and infinite ſuch places more, you ſhall find that plakket deere of a naked q. without a cap. But ſuppoſe that I could not finde it attributed to the Deitie in all theſe Scriptures, yet you were not the nearer your marke. For, if you bee remembred, your reaſon was in Chippenham, that *poreueſthai* cannot bee giuen to the Deitie, becauſe it is a verb of motion. Now, the *maior* of your ſyllogiſm muſt be, that no verb of motion can bee attributed to the Deitie. Which *maior* being craſed by my firſt anſwere, and the examples there alledged. There is no reaſon left you, why *pore-*

Anſwere.

Reply.

Rejoynder

reu-

reneſthai cannot be attributed to the Deitie, as wel as *erchesthai*, or *katabainein*: and no reaſon you knowe, is too weake againſt ten ſuch ſtout reaſons, as I haue ſent you, forcing this ſenſe vpon this place.

Your next argument, was from the participle (quickned) thus. No paſsiue can agree with the Deitie: Quickned is a paſsiue: *Ergo*, it cannot agree with the Deitie. This ſyllogiſm I granted to be good and told you withall, that wee doe not attribute this Participle to the Deitie, but to the whole Chriſt, by participation of proprieties, following the text which ſaith not, that the fleſh was mortified, and the ſpirit quickned: but that Chriſt was mortified in the fleſh, and quickened in the ſpirite. This anſwere, you ſtroke off your skore. 2. Obiection. Anſwere. No reply, no rejoinder.

Your third argument was from the tenſe or time of mortified and quickned thus. If theſe contraries bee attributed to Chriſt at one time, they note, that hee was deade and aliue at one time. But the firſt is true: *Ergo*, the laſt is true. To this I anſwere, denying the *maior*, That participles or verbs of one time attributed to one thing, muſte needes pertaine to one time. In the beleef, wee ſay, that Chriſt was crucified, dead, and buried: where crucified, dead, & buried, be all of one tenſe or time, & yet agree not all to Chriſt at one inſtance of time. To this you reply, that they muſte pertaine to one time, and proue your *maior* thus. Chriſt was after his paſsion dead or aliue at on time, or elſe neuer. If he were neuer dead and aliue at one time, S. Peter ſpeaketh not trulie. If hee were dead and aliue at one time, then I ſpeake falſe lie. In this Syllogiſme is neither mood nor figure: and beſides that, it ſtandeth on a begging of the queſtion, That Peter ſaieth hee was at one time deade and aliue, is the queſtion, and you take that, as if it were granted. 3. Obiect. Anſwere.

4. Objection. Your fourth reason was. If Peter saith, that the flesh was dead, and the Spirit quickened, then doeth hee shew, that he was both dead and aliue at one time. But the first is true: *Ergo*, the last is not false. The *minor* of this Syllogisme, I did denie: shewing, that it is flat against the text, which saieth not, that the flesh was dead, and the spirit quickened. But that Christ was dead in the flesh, and quickned in the spirit. This reason it pleaseth you of your courtesie to send away in secrete, without a God be with you.

Answere.

No reply, no Rejoynder.

5. Objection. Your fifth reason was. The Scripture doth join this going & preaching cloase to his passion, as if it wold say: As soone as hee had suffered, hee went and preached. I answered you, that (as) and (if) did carie too weake a consequence, in so waightie a matter. This asse sadled with an if (

Answere.

No reply, no Rejoynder.

'cause his
gs was to
ort to beare his bur
n out of the dirte:
rou left him in the
nire.

6. Objection. Your sixt reason was, out of the 6. of Genes. That the preaching of Noah, is there attributed to the third person of the Deitie, and not to the second. The words of that text bee. The Lord said, My spirit shall not alwaies striue with man, because hee is but flesh. Which wordes I answered you in the Latine that I sent you, that I neuer sawe anie interpreters. that doe consent with you in this exposition, and interprete these words of the third person of the Deitie. *Tremelius* and *Iunius* their judgement I set down, as that I liked best: who take these words to be a Hebraisme, sounding as if he had said, I wil not alwaies stand disputing with my selfe, what to do with these men which yeeld no frutes, but of flesh & blood: for, nowe I am determined (except they repent) to destroy them at the day appointed. Notwithstanding, granting you that it were as you would haue it, I tolde you, seeing the actions of euery person of the Deitie, are common to all three, hee erreth not that

Answere

giueth

giueth them to anie of the three. This you confesse to be true. But you ask me, if I can proue that Christ preached in Noah after his passion: affirming confidentlie, that this was attributed to him of Peter, after the passion. It were requisite that you had good proof according to the waight of this case, and your confidence in speaking it. But I will ease you of that burden. Proue it out of the text, with anie reasonable shew of truth, and you shall haue my hart and hand. The order of the wordes which you stand so stoutlie vpon, is not so strict, as you would haue it. For the purpose and drift of the Apostle heere, is to perswade vs to patience by the example of our Sauiour, and not to set out his death, descending and resurrection, in order as they were done: but *obiter* as they fall in hand, and followe the matter that heere he driveth to perswade. Reply. Rejoynder.

Your seauenth reason was, if Christ was raised from the dead, by the first person of the Deitie, and not by the second: then the word spirit heere, cānot be construed of the Deitie: but Christ was raised by the first person, and not by the second. *Ergo*, &c. I might well haue tolde you, that this *minor* is absurde and flat against the plaine text, Ioh. 5. 21. Whatsoeuer thing the Father doth, the same the sonne doeth also with him. And Ioh. 10. 18. which wordes I did quote not farre before, in the defence of my second reason. I haue power to lay downe my life, and I haue power to take it vp again. But then sparing you and refraining all hard speeches, how euer they were due, I onelie tolde you; that I sawe not howe that could stand with the trueth of the Scriptures, which telleth mee, that the second person did put on man, and did not forsake him in all his distresses. You reply in the margent of your written copy, see contrarie to this Act. 4. 40: Act. 13. 30. 1. Cor. 15. 15. Which 7. Objection. Answere Reply Rejoynder.

places I haue marked & obserued, to make nothing against my assertion. In them the raising vp of christ, is attributed to the God-head, which worketh not (as I haue noted alreadie) one person without another. Which thing, if it bee an errour, it was Iohn that seduced mee. cap. 5. 7. The Father worketh, and I work. As the Father doth raise vp the deade, so the sonne likewise, doth raise vp whome he will. And in the 17. verse, quoted a little aboue. The same is agreable to other infinite places of Scripture, and the somme of our Faith, called the beleef, which saieth; the third day hee rose againe, and not that hee was raised againe.

8. Objection. Your eight reason was. If the time that they were preached to, and of their disobedience, was not one: then this preaching is not to bee vnderstood of Noah his preaching, in the time of their disobedience.

Answere But the adverbe *pote* doth distinguish those times. *Ergo*, &c. To this I answere, that the Adverb *pote*, doth not determine the participle *apeitheſaſi*, but the principall verbe *ekeryxen*, You replie, that I speak neither

Reply. like a Divine, nor like a Grammarian. To proue me no divine, which indeede I am not: and no Grammarian, which I am but little: you alledge no Diuinitie, and little grammer. It will not followe, that because it may stand with a Participle, therefore it is so heere: or, that because it is distinguished from the verb, with a *comma*, therefore it cannot determine it at all.

Rejoynder You are not ouer-loden with Grammar, if you knowe not, that diuerse and manie reasons, may part wordes depending one on the other, by a *comma*. And as for this place, *pote*, if it did depend (as you would haue it) vpon *apeitheſaſi*, it cannot bee distinguished from *ekeryxen* with a *comma*, seing *apeitheſaſi* it self, is gouerned of *ekeryxen*, without commixture of anie interjected member to parte them. What

euer

ouer your book hath, take heed, that it be not a stain to your skill in grammar, to credite a book in such a case.

Your ninth argument was. Noah preched to men These were spirits & not men: *Ergo*, Noah preached not to these. I answered, that whosoeuer preacheth to men, preacheth to spirites, because no men want spirits, that is, reasonable soules. And now I ad, that they are heer called Spirits, in respect of their imprisonment, not in respect of his preaching. If hee had called them men, then the name of prison wherein they are now datained, had beene improper. The Apostle wisely choosed that worde, which might best agree with both those times. *Bezaes* opinion also, whereto *Andradius* the Papist agreeth, is most probable, that *pote* doth determine the same Participle *apeitheſasi*, and doeth distinguish it from *tois en phylake pneumasi*, which must needs be vnderstood in the present time, by vertue of the participle *ousi*, in that kind of phrase in Greek, most necessarily alwaies implyed. You reply not one worde to the purpose: but charging vs with that we neuer spake, nor thought (that we take these spirits for the men in Noahs time) you alleadge Christs words against vs, Luk. 24.39. But if you were a man, that coulde marke the wordes of them that dispute against you, & take them as they are spoken: you should finde, that wee say not that hee preached to the spirites in the dayes of Noah: But to the spirites that nowe are in prison, and were disobedient in the dayes of Noah. If you can anie waies turne Christs wordes in Luke, to confute this, you neede not to care, what thinges you take vpon you to proue. If you can proue, that Noah preaching to the men of his time, did not preach to their Spirites: or that these spirits in prison, which Peter speaketh heer of, were not the same that rebel-

led in the dayes of Noah, you may driue vs from this holde: otherwiſe you may throw your cap at vs.

10. Objection. Laſt of all, you charge our conſtruction with violence. I anſwered, that you do vs wrong, charging vs with things, that none of vs do ſpeak. Which anſwer

Anſwere you paſſe by with ſilence, and ſo allow it for currant.

To theſe you haue added two new ones, which (to take away all ſcruple, I will anſwere alſo.

11. Objection. Firſt, ſay you, if the word *phylake* doth ſignifie hel, then Chriſt did deſcend into hell: But *phylake* doeth ſignifie Hell. *Ergo*, &c. I denie the *maior*, it will not follow, though *phylake* doeth ſignifie hell (as heere it

Anſwere. doth indeed Metaphoricallie) that therefore Chriſt deſcended into Hell: neither doth the place that you quote of Math. proue that you would haue: except you can proue alſo, that *phylake* hath no other ſignification, then the priſon of vtter darkneſſe, &c.

12. Objection. Your other reaſon is. He that was killed, dead, and quickened, did preach. But it was Chriſt that was killed, dead, and quickned: *Ergo*, it was Chriſt that preached, and not his Deitie. Chriſt, and not his Deitie, M. Doctor? Can Chriſt preach, and not his Deitie? You may ſay what you will. If I had let fall ſuch a word, you would haue cried, *Crucifige*. But to an-

Anſwere. ſwere you, I denie the *maior*. It is againſt the text. He was mortified, that is, killed and dead in the fleſhe, and that preached not. Hee was quickned in the ſpirite, and in that hee went and preached. That which preached, was neither killed nor dead; neither was it ſelf quickened: but Chriſt was quickened in it.

Theſe are all your objections. In my anſwere to your ſermon, I anſwered 10. of them. You haue replyed to 6. of them, and to the other 4. you haue giuen a pardon at large, neuer to be troubled by you. Your ſix replyes I haue heere rejoyned too, and haue met your newe ſupplies at the encounter, and haue

ſent

sent them home to you for new help. All your forces thus defeated, and so mightie and resolute an armie against you, (if there bee anie conformitie in you, if your neck be not so stiffe, that no bridle can turn it) I hope you will get you to *Chippenhames* pulpit, and performe your promise.

HVME *Sect.* 13.

THese things being thus, I pray you (good M.D.) seeing you woulde haue vs vndoubtedly to beleeue, that Christ descended into Hell. Tel vs vndoutedly to what ende he should descend thither. I trust you will not teach vs, neither Augustine, neither Ieromes lesson, that he went thither to deliuer prisoners. As for that new lesson, that he went thither to triumph: it standeth not with the maner of conquerours, to shew the glorie of their conqueste amongst the conquered: but amongst them to whom the ioy of the victorie doth appertaine: and for mine owne part, I haue oftentimes read the name of Hell, ioyned with shame and ignomie: but to this day, I neuer hard it ioyned with triumph and glorie. Neither seemeth it probable, that if Christ had purposed to shewe the pompe of his conqueste, he woulde haue done it before his resurrection, leste being yet in the handes of his enemie, he had met him with the proverbe, *Ante victoriam, &c.* To these reasons, may be added, that seeing his triumph was celebrated at one instance, in Heauen, Earth, and Hell: if the presence of his soule was required, as you beare in hand it will followe, that his soule was at one instant in these three places, which is contrary to the nature of a soule. You adde two other causes, to binde the deuill, and deliuer vs from hel. You bring vs many places of Scripture, to confirme this geare. Gen. 3. 15. *The seed of the woman shal breake the Serpents head.* Ose. 13

15. *O death, I will be thy death, O hell I wil be thy destructiō* 1. Cor. 15. 55. *O death, where is thy sting, O hell where is thy victorie.* In all which places, there is not a sillable sounding, that Christ descended into hell. As for his triumphing ouer Hell, we neuer denied it, and do avouch that he performed, that moste gloriouslie, by the power of his God-head, which did present his victorie ouer his enemies, hell and death: both to heven earth and Hel, without the presence of his soule.

The Paralogisme of this section.

491. Those 3 ends in your opinion, are not ends indeede.

492. He triumphed ouer hell & death in heuē, earth and hell: not in hell onelie

493. If it was all one actiō to binde the Diuel, & to take away his power, that he did, by his death, Heb. 2. 14.

494. That he did by his death also.

495. *Dic sodes*: Had the Diuels neuer known his death, except he had gone

H. H. *his Reply.*

YOu aske me why Christ descended into hell, and yet you cōfes I noted 491 three ends of Christs descending into hell, the one to 492 triumph ouer the Diuels: the other to 493 binde the Diuels, and to take awap their power ouer mankind: 494 the 3. to deliuer vs from hell. There was also set downe a fourth end, that is, 495 to manifest his death vnto those in hel, and to reproue them of their incredulity: and heer labouring to catch me in a snare, you are fallen into it your selfe: for firste you say, Christ conquered hell on the Crosse, then as hauing forgotten your selfe you aske this question with admiration. Howe could he 496 conquer being in the graue? Is it likly that hee would triumph before his victory? First you stoutly affirme that he had conquered, then you boldly 497 deny it. 498 *Cōeniet nulli qui secū dissidet ipse.* Next you say, you haue not read the 499 name of hell, but ioyned with shame and infamie: why do you write then, that the 500 Godhead did triumph ouer hel; Did you not read your owne writing I am sure in this place? 1. Cor. 15. 55. O death where is thy sting, 501 O hell where is thy victory, 502

The

downe to the damned. 496. You forge: my words were, hōw could he triumph ouer death, being in the bands of death. 497. Not it that I said. 498. *Ast ego mihi satis consentio.* 499. So saith August. I neuer read the name of Hell *in bonam partem*. ad Evod. epist. 99. 500. 501. 502. In these places the name of hel, is separate frō triūph & glory

The nam of hel is ioined with triumph. But you answere these places with a flat negatiue. heere is not a sillable to proue the descending of Christ into hell. I am sure Paule prouеth heer, the 503 resurrection of Christ and of our soules, and how can he proue the resurrection, vnlesse hee proue the knitting together of the body and soule? for as death is the parting of body & soule, so resurrection is the reuniting of them togither againe, and heer Paule sheweth that the body comming out of the graue, 504 & the soule from hell, Christ did conquere both. And therefore it is not the deity 505 as you say, but the humane nature of Christ, ỳ did vanquish death & Hell. 506 Heb. 2. 14. For as much then, as the children were partakers of flesh and bloud, he also him selfe likewise took parte with them, that hee might destroy through death, him that had power of death, that is the Diuil. There fore Hemingius on the Col. 2. saith. As on the Crosse he conflicted with the diuil, so by the glorious descending into hell, resurrection and ascention hee did triumph. 507 Therfore these places proue his descending into hell as well as the buriall, for the reason of ỳ apostle is this. Christ cam out of the graue, *ergo*, he conquered death, 508 and Christ came out of hell. *ergo* he ouer came hell. Therefore thus I reason 509 against you, that did conquere which did fight, but the human nature of Christ, did fight, *ergo* it did also conquere, 510 & is gone vp into heauen, to whom the Angels: powers and mightes be subiect. 511 1. Pet. 3. 22. Col. 2, 25. phil. 2. 9. 10. Eph. 1. 20. 21. 22. Therefore, sith all these Scriptures do witnes, that Christ as man did triumph, and is exalted, and hath al power, I doubt not but in your next answere you will reforme your 512 iudgement.

563. That is not his descending into hel Frame this argument in mood & figur, and you shall be collector the next lent.

504 Wherein doth Paule shew that?

505. Where said I so: what will you blush to charge me with?

506. You haue a special grace to proue things not denied.

507. It followeth not.

598. Where said the Apost so? Where is now *Procustes* his rack.

509. Not mee, but your own shadow.

510. If this were doutfull you conclude more, then you include in the premisses.

511. These quotations are impertinent, 512. My judgement was neuer deformed with this scare: and therefore needeth heerein no reformation.

HVME his Reioynder to the 13. sect.

IBeseech thee, (good Reader) take a little paines heer, to mark the honest dealing of this D. Whet I say, Christ could not triumph beeing in the bonds of death: hee for (triumph) sets (conquer) to make them contrarie to my former words, that Christ did conquere Hell vpon the crosse. It is one thing to cõquere, another thing, to triumph. *Pompey* conquered the mightie *Mithridates* in *Syria*, but hee triumphed at Rome amongst his freends, that were pertakers of the joy. Againe, where I say with *Augustine*, that the name of Hell is joined with shame, not with honour: meaning the name of hell is shamefull, not glorious: he takes mee to say, that the name of hell cannot stand in a sentence, with a word of honour, & quotes against mee. 1. Cor. 15, 55. Hell, where is thy victorie? in which place, hell and victorie, are separated, as if hee had saide, Hell thou hast no victorie. Thirdlie, whereas I say, that Christ triumphed by the power of his Deitie: presenting his victorie to heauen, earth and Hell; he giues out that I say, that the Godhead triumphed, and not the humanitie, & notes in the margent, *Hume* contrarie to Paule and Peter: and wils mee to reforme this fault in my next reply. This is M. D. arte: If his cause were so good, as he would haue it seeme: he needed not this cunning: or, if he caried as honest a minde, as he did protest in Chippenham pulpit: hee would rather performe his promise, then seeke such vn-christian-like shiftes to maintaine a bad cause.

Aug. ad Evod. 99.

Now to answere his cavils. I ask you M. Doct. why you send Christ to hell, notwithstanding the three ends that you had noted, because those endes, were no endes thereof: and becaus the Scripture doeth teach

teach, that hee had performed all those ends by the conqueſt of Hel, vpon this croſſe. You brought texts of Scripture to proone them, and I anſwered truely, that not one of them ſoundeth anie ſillable that way. For, in all thoſe places there is not a letter, neither of his deſcending into hell, nor of his triumphing ouer hell. You replie, that thoſe texts do proue the reſurrection (which is not true of all neither) and that the reſurrection is a knitting of the ſoule and bodie together: and that the knitting of them together, was by bringing his ſoule from Hell (this is your principle) and his bodie from the graue. Now, add the concluſion, that hee that proueth Chriſts reſurrection, proueth his deſcending into hell. If this reaſon bee good, I will yeelde. For, now (if it will holde) you haue found a way to proue your opinion, by all the Scriptures. When Chriſt cured the blinde mans eies with ſpittle, it is plaine, that he was a man: If he was a man, he was mortall, and died: If hee died, his ſoule went to hel, (this is your vndoubted principle) and his bodie to the graue. *Ergo*, he that writes that Chriſt cured the blinde mans eies with ſpittle, doeth write that hee went to Hell. By this hooke, you may pull all the Scriptures out at the window, and make them proue what pleaſeth you.

Hvme *his* 14. *Sect.*

YOu alledge for confirmation of the ſecond. How can a man enter into a ſtrong mans houſe and ſpoyle his goodes, except firſt hee binde the ſtrong man. Here is not that which you vndertooke, to proue that he deſcended into hell, to binde the deuilles. This houſe whereof here is ſpoken, is to any man of judgments eye, by circumſtance of the place, not Hell: but this worlde, whereof the deuill had ta-

ken poſſeſsion, and polluted many hearts: out of the which, he was caſt by Chriſt, who thereby prooueth himſelfe to be ſtronger then he: and not to woorke myracles in the name of Beel-zebub, as the Phariſes did beare the ſimple people in hand.

HIL *his Reply.*

The Paralogiſmes in the D. Reply.
513. That cānot be, ſee the anſwere.
514. How oft haue you told this tale, and neuer proued it.
515. Quote the place: theſe wordes are ſuſpitious, and ſound more like Hill then Cyril
516. This (for) is as doutfull, as the thing it is brought for
517. Crambe, twiſe at one ſeruice: you might haue ſpared it till the next courſe.
518. Euen as you haue painted it in your book.
519. A Grecian wold haue tranſlated it, into the houſe of Pluto, Lord of Hell: or more Chriſtian like, into the houſe of death.

YOur interpretation is true: 513 and the other true alſo, for 514 Chriſt did not onlie ouercome the Diuell in ẏ world, but alſo in Hell. For, as Cyrill noteth on this place: there was before the comming of Chriſt much violence, taking away the flock of God, and carrying them to his owne houſe: wherefore before the comming of Chriſt, the heathen and people of the worlde went into eternall death: But Chriſt hath deliuered both their bodies frō the graue and their ſoules from Hell, by his death and 515 perſonall deſcending into Hell. This place is alleaged by one Georgius Princeps Anhaltinus, in his learned commentaries on the 16. Pſalm, which you may read, if you pleaſe. 516 For as Dauid trampled on the face of Goliah, 517 ſo did the ſoule of Chriſt trample on Satan in hell, 518 and trode on his face: and this is noted by the Propheteſſe Sibilla, as alſo by the heathen Poets, whoſe wordes I haue ſet down in my ſermon at large. And therefore Clenard in his grammer gluetly this obſeruation, *katelthonta eis adou*, id eſt, *eis oikian ton adou*, he went down into hell, that is, into 519 the houſe of Hell.

HVME *his Reioynder to the* 14. *Sect.*

YOu graunt my interpretation to bee true: but I will not graunt yours, except you bring better war-

warrant then your ſelf, and a man that I neuer ſawe. You will mee to buy him. I am not ſo well purſt as to buy him onlie, to ſee this that you quote him for, my interpretation is defend-able without him. It ſtandeth ſo ſure vpon the text, that you confeſſe it your ſelfe. You would faine ſhoulder in yours too, and make the Scriptures double tongued: but I haue learned, that one text, hath but one true meaning. Though mans opinions may differ, there is but one that hits the naile on the head. I neede no better proofe therfore, to confute your interpretation, then your own confeſsion. Onelie this I add, that ſeeing your interpretation is doubtfull, it can bring no vndoubtfull proof, to your doubtfull and falſe opinion. As for the Sybiles, and Heathen Poets you did well to ſpare them. The quoting of them would haue beene more laborious, then their teſtimonies would haue beene effectual in this caſe. Whē you haue to doe with a heathen (as ſome of the Fathers had) they may ſtand you in ſtead, [redacted] as they did them [redacted]. As for the greeke *eis tou adou*, you conſtrue it wrong, into the hous of hel. Hel hath not a houſe. They that ſpeak ſo, meant the hous of *Pluto*, called *ades* in greek: the Lord of death, as the heathen did imagine. So is that word vſed by *Nonnus* ſpeaking of *Lazarus* raiſed from the death by Chriſt.

Αἰδης δε μαλην παρα γειτονι λιθῃ
παυδαματως δαμαζον εδιζετο νεκρον αλυκτην.

HVME *his* 15. *Sect.*

NOw one thing remaineth, wherein you ſeemed to runne beyond your ſelfe, and moſt men did wonder, what you ment thereby. Whereas our Saviour vpon the Croſſe, did vtter to the hearers then, & all poſterities after, that he had finiſhed the work of our Redemption: You took vpon you toprooue,

that he meant not ſo: bearing the worlde as it were in hand, that wee can ſpeake nothing ſo trulie, but that you cā confute it. To this purpoſe you alleaged theſe places, I haue finiſhed the worke which thou gaueſt me. As they had finiſhed all things that were written of him. And ſeeing all thinges now finiſhed that the Scriptures might bee fulfilled. Out of all which places (ſay you) it is apparent, that there remained ſome things to be done after. What needeth all theſe proofes in a matter that no man denieth. It is confeſſed of all men (I hope) that when hee ſpake this, he had not yet giuen vp the ghoſt. But I truſt, you will not denie, that his meaning was, that his worke was finiſhed, when hee had breathed the laſte breath. Which thing (if you grant) you haue proued nothing againſt our aſſertion. It is a common thing (you knowe) to ſpeak that in the time paſt, which is meant that it ſhall come to paſſe ſhortlie after. Such were theſe words of Chriſt, it is finiſhed. And like to [redacted] wordes in another place. Beholde, the houre commeth, and it is [redacted] ſhalbee ſcattered. Where he ſaieth, that the houre is alreadie come, which was to come ſhortlie after. This muſt needs be the meaning of Chriſts wordes. Neither could he otherwiſe (as man) ſhewe to thoſe malitious perſecuters that ſtood about him, and vs that read it now to our comforts, that he had made an end of his worke, and was paſt the malice of all his enemies, except he ſhould haue tolde it them, after that hee had giuen vp the ghoſt. Which thing could not haue beene done, without the miraculous aſsiſtance of his God-head, which did in all his paſſion (as it were) hide it ſelf, and ſuffer the innocent man, as man, to pay the ranſom of mans redemptiō Heere you gaue vs a diſtinction of *conſummatum re*, & *conſummatum ſpe*. Deliuer it againe, to the dunces whence

Ioh 17.4
Act. 13.29.
Ioh. 19.28.

whence you had it. There is no haire ſo ſmall, which thoſe ſubtile wits, wil not finde a wedge to cleaue, rather then confes it to be a haire, if it make againſt their conceit, be it neuer ſo groſſe, and erroneous. And tell thoſe *Harpyæ quæ tactu ſuo optimas dapes fœdarunt*: that a thing may bee *conſummatum ſpe*, which a man meaneth not to begin 20. yeares hence, & perhappes neuer finiſhe. Heere wee all wondered what you meant, and were affraied, leaſt you would haue ſent Chriſt downe to Hell to ſuffer. Which if you did you muſt needes argue him of an vntrueth, who is trueth it ſelfe. For his worke had then beene ſo farre from an end, that hee had not beene flea-bitten in reſpect of that, which was to come. This trulie M. Hill, was not ware worthie of your wit.

HILL *his Reply.*

519 HEer you haue ſpoken much and proued nothing, 520 for of thoſe reaſons which I haue laide downe in my Sermon concerning this point, not one is anſwered. Onely as you tolde mee before 521 I was immodeſt, ſo now you tell mee 522 I am a mad man, and the wonder of the world. 523 I muſt anſwere you with Dauid, I am become as a monſter vnto many, but my truſt is in thy lawe. 524. But what will men Iudge of you, that in one and the ſame matter affirme and deny. 525 You confeſſe in the begining, that there remaine ſomewhat to doo, and in the ende you wonder at mee becauſe I ſayd, al things wer not finiſhed on the croſſe.

The Paralogiſmes in this ſect

519. What I haue ſpoken is either proued, or needs no proof.

520 I knowe but one reaſō in all the ſermon vnanſwered, and that was not worth an anſwere.

521. 522. Both vntrue He is not well in his wits that could pike ſuch a mad ſenſe out of ſo tame words. 523. I objected nothing to you. I pray God you vſe theſe words as Dauid did. I wiſh you no more ill. 524. Your malice is ſharper then your accuſation. 525. There remained ſomewhat whē he ſpake theſe words, and nothing after his death on the croſſe, are not contraries, if both your eies could looke one way.

526. It could not be otherwise: for it had beene strange if hee had cried that, after that he had giuen vp the ghost.
527. Then were christs vntrue
528. That hee shed before
529. You can doe well to proue things not denied, we haue proued your strength alreadie.
530. I denie the sequele.
531. Or else by you.
532. 533. I thank you, you favour me much.
534. Proue that, & I haue done.
535. It neuer grew in that soile.
536. 537. 538. 539. What makes all this or any thing heer to proue that Christ hath consummat our salvation *spe nõ re*.
540. This is not to the purpose

Your next words are these, whē our Sauiour cryed it is finished, he had not giuen vp the ghoste which was the end of his worke. 526 It is true, that after the speking of *Consummatum est*, it is finished, he gaue vp ẏ ghost, 527 but that was not ẏ finishing of his worke, 528 for he must also shed his bloud. Heb. 9.22. Without sheading of blood their is no forgiuenes of sins. 1. Pet. 1.19. Iohn, 1. 7. Apoc. 1.5. 529 In all which scriptures it is set down, that we are redemed with the pricious blood of Christ. The blood of Christ doth purge vs from all sinne: he hath loued vs and washt away our sins in his blood. 530 Therefore the giuing vp of the ghost, was not the ende of his worke. 531 Heere is a fault committed by you, 532 but I will not wonder at you, nor say you are runn besides your selfe, 533 but you runn against your selfe, 534 and resist also the holy ghost. Then you scornefully reiect my dessincion of *Consummatum re*, and *Consummatum spe*, that is, finished in hope, and finished in deede. I will defend it, for it commeth not out of the Diuines, 535 but out of Gods sacred word. Rom. 8.24. it is said, 536 We are saued by hope. 537 Gal. 5.5. for we through the spirit, wait for the hope of righteousnes throgh faith. 538 Luc. 21.24. Lift vp your head (saith Christ to his Disiples) for your redemtion draweth nigh. 539 Rom. 8.23. And not onely the creature, but we also which haue the first frutes of the spirite doo fight, even we doo fight in our selues waiting for adoption, even the redemption of our body. 540 Musculus on the fourth Chapter of the Ephesians thus writeth, the places are these, That we are called in hope, not in deede, & that the hope of future blessings, is ẏ store of our faith, as long as we are in this flesh, for we are saued, *nondum in re sed in spe*, not yet in deede but in hope. By all these scrip-

scriptures it is manifest, that 541 our consummation is in hope, and not in deed (as Musculus noteth) neither shall be actually perfited, vntil the day of iudgement. Therfore, I did with this distinction 542 refute the argument which is made of those that ar on your side, 543 who thus conclude. Christ sayde on the crosse (It is finished) *Ergo*, hee went not downe to to hell. By the same reason I thus argue. Christ said on ỳ crosse (It is finished) 544 *Ergo*, he did not shed his blould, 545 nor was buried, 546 nor rose againe, 547 nor ascended into heauen to fulfill all things. Ephes. 4. 10. for if all things were then fulfilled on the crosse, what neede he to ascende, to fulfill all things. 548 Therfore, I did proue that this argumẽt of yours, did mak no more against the descending into hell, then against the sheading of his blould, burial, resurrection, ascention or iudgement, al which are necessary to our 549 weale, and perfit consummation. 550 Farther, to proue my distinction to be true, I did then quote, that as Christ is said to be the Lamb, slaine from the beginning of the world, so the death of Christ did reach to the first beleeuers, and shall do to the last. Which consummation by hope, is so enioyed, as if wee possessed it already: for all the promises of Christ, are yea, and Amen, 2. Cor. 1. 20. 551 Therfore, I told you this argument, (It is finished) *ergo*, Christ went not down to hel was a fallacy *a dicto secundum quid ad simpliciter*. And I noted how these words were to be vnderstod. 552 First, that al the scripture and prophecies were fulfilled, for so the text noteth. 553 Secondly, it is finished, doth signifye, there is no other sacrifice for sinne: for by one sacrifice once offred, he hath made perfite all that shall be sanctified, Hebr. 10, 14. And therefore the Papists ioyning ỳ merits of Saints with the merits of Christ, doo erre most shamefully. 554 Thirdly, it was fini-

541. The question is not of our consummation: but how Christ hath consummat the work of our redemption.

542. You wold say answere.

543. We conclude not so, see the answer 544. This is a wonderful argumẽt. Christ saying, it is finished, died by shedding his blood: *ergo* he shed no blood.

545. 546. 547. These wer adiuncts, but not works of our redemption.

548. You can neuer proue it.

549. That is not the quest.

550. To no purpose.

551. But our argument wil not take that staine.

552. 553. 554. 555. 556. All these be answered, fol. 16. & 17. of your sermon.

finished as concerning all his labours and sorrowes. 556 Fourthly al his suffrings both of body & soule were ended, which he finished on ỳ crosse. 556 Briefly, his obedience to his Father was ended, for he yelded a pure, perfit, and perpettuall obedience to his Father, and therfore had al power giuen him in heauen, earth, and hel. Wherefore, I did proue this interpretation by this text, 557 1.Cor.15.54. Then shall be brought to pas the saying that is written, ô death where is thy sting, O hell where is thy victory, 558 and did alleage Beda, Peter Martyr, and Musculus vp on this place, all which were of my iudgement, and therefore you had noe more cause to wonder at mee, then at these learned men, whome 559 all the reformed Churches of England doe reuerence. Last of al, you seeme to charge me, as though I had sayd that Christ went downe to suffer, which thing I neuer mentioned, but that hee wente downe to 560 manifest his death, to triumph in 561 his owne person ouer the Diuell, 562 and personally to redeme vs from hell. Then you call them dunces whence I had that destinction. 563 I had it from Musculus, and Musculus from the word of God, 564 & therefore you must embrace these distinctions, or else you will speake erroneouslie. *Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete.* Try all things, holde that which is best. 565 This worke is worthy my wit or any other Interpreters. Neither will I leaue the ware that is in my poore pack for all the treasures of Egypt.

557. That text proues it not.
558. These men deny not that he finished our redemption on the crosse
559. These be perilous words. Be there anie Churches in England vnreformed?
560. That was an obscure manifestation.
561. Who sayes he triumphed in an other person then his own?
562. Did he redeem vs on the crosse by a deputie?
563. You had it not from him, nor he from the word of God.
564. I denie the sequele.
565. Beware it is, howsoeuer your wit and it doth agree.

An absurditie in the D. Reply.

That Christ beeing nailed handes and feete to the Crosse, died without shedding of blood.

HVME *his Reioynder to the* 15. *sect.*

OVr opinion is, that Christ vpon the Crosse, did offer a perfect sacrifice for our sinnes, and finish the

the whole worke of our redemption. This we proue by his owne laſt words, It is finiſhed. For, after the manner of men, who hauing brought their worke to the laſt ſtroake, ſay (they haue done) & withall make an end: Hee hauing borne all the malice that death and Hell could inflict, told the ſtanders by, that hee had done. And this hee did immediatlie before hee gaue vp the ghoſt: becauſe hee could not as hee was man, tell them the ſame after that he was dead. Neither wanted this ſpeach great reaſon. It was to make full our hope, and to confirme our faith, which otherwiſe might haue ſtood in ſuſpenſe. For, ſeeing our ſinnes had deſerued, not onelie the temporall death, which the beholders did ſee him die: but alſo all the deathes of Hell, which they, nor no mortal eie, could ſee him ſuffer: He tolde them himſelf, that hee had finiſhed and done all, that there might remaine no ſcruple for vs to doubt of. Thus therefore wee reaſon againſt theſe men. If Chriſt finiſhed the whole worke of our Redemption vpon the croſſe, there remained nothing for him to do in hel. But he did finiſhe the whole worke of our redemption vpon the Croſſe: *Ergo*, there remained nothing for him to do in hell. This Syllogiſme is ſo ſtrong, that you dare not denie one ſyllable of it. Wherfore, when I hard you in the pulpit violate the text wheron it ſtādeth, I could not chooſe but tell you, that you ranne beyond your ſelfe, and made your audience feare, leaſt you would haue ſent Chriſt to Hell to ſuffer, an error indeede, but ſuch, as ſome better divines then your ſelf, that ſealed the truth with their blood, to avoid the abſurdities of your opinió, did fall into in King Edwards time, when your opinion was moſt generallie embraced, and confirmed by convocation. Whereas you ſay, that I ſay much and proue little: I proue as much as I intend. It was not my purpoſe

to confute anie thing that you had ſpoken trulie. For theſe words (it is finiſhed) are not to be referred to the inſtant, when they were ſpoken, but to the end of his paſsion, which immediatly followed. This you confeſſe, and why ſhould I confute you? Or which is ſtranger, howe could you finde a contrarietie in my wordes, and ſee none in your owne ſpeaking the ſame, that I doe. But this is amongeſt much more worſe then this, the frute of your malice. And heer in your ſermon at Chippenham, there was no more between vs, but onlie that you made a countenance to confute that which we avouch, & you confes: convaying your batterie in ſuch ſorte, that you made the beholders thinke, that you plaied vpon our ſconce, but in very deede, did ieuell all your ordinance another way. But now you are growne ſomewhat further from mee: for, though you confeſſe that Chriſt went not to hell to ſuffer: and that he died immediatlie after he ſaid, (It is finiſhed:) yet you denie, that this was the end of his worke. Your reaſon is, that hee had not ſhed his blood, and that without ſhedding of blood, there is no remiſsion of ſinnes. And may wee beleeue you M. Doctor? That Chriſt was nailed hands and feet to the croſſe, without ſhedding of his blood? If you will haue vs ſo credulous as to thinke this may be true, firſt reſolue vs of what grief Chriſt died, in not much more, then three of our cõmon houres: being onelie wounded in the hands & feete, if not of the effuſion of his heart blood. Your diſtinction of *conſummatum re*, and *conſummatum ſpe*, you will needes haue vs beleeue, that it was bred in Gods booke. You muſt bring better proofe then I ſee, or elſe it neuer receaued bark nor branch in that ſoile. The thing that you ſhould proue, is, that the ſacrifice of Chriſt was finiſhed in hope, not in deede. That we are ſaued in hope, Rom. 8.24. That we waie

for

for the hope of our righteouſneſſe. Gal. 5. 5. That we lift vp our heades, becauſe our redemption draweth neere. Luke. 21. 8. That we ſigh, waiting for the hope, euen the redemption of our bodies. Rom. 8. 23. What makes all this, to proue that Chriſt did finiſhe our redemption onelie in hope? The queſtion is heere, how Chriſt hath finiſhed our redemption? not, how we poſſeſſe it. Seeing our hope is not vncertaine and vnſtable, but ſetled on a ſure ground: doth not theſe places rather proue, that Chriſt hath done al fullie and abſolutely? For if he did but hope how could wee be ſure? Your vnſhapely argument that you would fain faſten on vs, and your other arguments caſt in the ſame moulde, to ſhew the abſurditie of it, with your long impertinent tale of the reſt of your ſermon, I will let paſſe, as helping you as little, as hurting vs. Your counſel concerning the Dunces, I am not yet readie for: when I haue read all better bookes, then I will read them. For as worthie men as they are in your eies, I cannot hope that they will confirme my judgement, to make mee goe ſure: ſeeing your ſelf beeing ſo well acquainted with them, cannot keep your owne feet from ſtumbling.

HVME *Sect.* 16.

IN the end of your ſermon, you produce two inconueniences that you ſay, muſt needs followe, if this article bee not beleeued. The queſtion is not about the trueth, but about the meaning of this article. Heere, you do vs open wrong, and accuſe your ſelf of an vntruth. You tolde vs in the beginning of your ſermon, that neither *M. Chaulfont*, nor *M. Wiſedome* did doubt of his deſcending into Hell, and why now labour you to load your aduerſaries with enuie: as if they tooke away hell, and the benefite of

Chriſts paſsion. What Rhethorick ſoeuer this bee, it is bad Diuinitie. Wee neuer denied that hee went downe into Hell, but that euer hee deſcended into the pit of the damned. From whence, if you will in good logick, gather your concluſion: your wit reacheth manie myles beyond our capacities. For, wee are perſwaded, that there can be no ſurer argument, neither of Hel, nor of the certaintie of our redemption; then that he ſuffered all the tormentes of Hell vpon the croſſe, and made a full ſatisfaction for all our offences. Which thing, he could not haue done, if there were no hell: and which thing, if hee hath done (as we are ſurelie perſwaded) there is nothing more ſure then our redemption. For, ſeeing hee ſuffered vpon the tree, the paine of al our ſinnes, as Peter witneſſeth, and hell was due to our iniquities: it is as ſure, (as what is moſt ſure) that vpon the tree, that is, vpon the croſſe, hee deſcended into the lowermoſt Hell; that is, into the heavieſt torments that Hell could yeeld: and this, except you will confeſſe, you muſt grant that the Symboll (as wee call it) of the Apoſtles, and doe ſo reuerentlie embrace, is vnperfect. For ſeeing the greateſt part of our redemption, conſiſteth in Chriſts ſuffering in ſoule, for our ſoules: it was more needfull in that Symbol to make mention of them, thē of the deth of his body, both becauſe they were more horrible vnto him, and further remooued from our ſenſes. Which thing, if it be true, (as it is moſt certaine) in what other words (I pray you) of that Symboll, is that contained? but in theſe, he deſcended into hell? For, that which goeth before, hee was crucified, dead and buried, may be as well affirmed of the the theeues, that ſuffered with him.

HIL *his Reply.*

IThought two inconueniences, 566 if this article were denyed. 567 to moue the people, not to leaue out any. It is not vnknowne to you, that 568 Seruetus and 569 Carlill deny it, and 570 diuers others now liuing among vs (by reaſon of the 571 negatiue doctrine which is preached of your ſide) will not repete this branch of the creed (he deſcended into hel.) 572 And ſome haue ſayd to my face, that Thomas Aquinas did inſert it into the Creede. 573 Of theſe men I know too many, againſt whome I did direct my ſpeach, 574 for feare leaſt ſome might bee in that populous aſſembly. 575 Bad do they, that deny ỹ perſonal deſcẽding, but worſe do they, which deny both perſonal and potentiall. 576 Therefore I was not contrary to my ſelf, but contrary to thoſe which haue giuen 577 occaſion, that ſo comfortable an article of our Chriſtian faith, ſhould be 578 put out of the Creede. You ſay, it was my parte to deale plainely, 579 for I preached the truth. *Obſequium amicos, veritas odium parit.* Flatterye getteth freends, truth getteth hatred. I knowe the eares of that 580 Auditory did itche for other 581 matter, but I am Gods Miniſter. & I haue preached Gods truth, which I will (by the help of my God) defend, 582 againſt all gainſayers what ſo euer.

The Paralogiſ of this ſection.

566. This ground was vncertaine: you are ready to gueſſe, whē you are willing to ſpeak.

567. To moue mē not to do that, that you cannot name one man that doth.

568. 569. Seruetus I neuer ſaw. Carlill doth not deny it: bluſh for ſhame.

570. Name one.

571. Vntruth.

572: Twentie to one, they were men of your owne ſide.

573. Anie is too manie: but I beleeue, your manie is not anie 574. Except I am deceaued. your feare wanted a ſubject. 575. Who be they M. Doctor? 576. And worſe do you, if you know none ſuch. 577. But you were, except you can coine a better excuſe then this. 578. They that hold not heere a negatiue, did not giue ſuch an occaſion with a negatiue. 579. A priuate mans fault cannot wel be called the putting out of an article. 580. So you ſay. 581. Not at your hand: and yet the common ſort were well pleaſed. *Obſecutus multis, paucos irritaſti.* 582. So there be manie that diſſent frō you. 583. Hard and ſcarſe.

Hvme *his Reioynder to the 16. Section.*

BEtter a bad excuſe, (ſaith the proverb) but better to confeſſe a fault. You alledged theſe incõueniences, (you ſay) to moue the people not to leaue out anie of the articles of their faith. Men vſe to apply ſalues to ſores, but I beleeue you knowe not one ſore for this ſalue. Yet you ſay, you know manie that will not repeat this article, by meanes of the negatiue on our ſide. I thinke it is like true, that you know anie ſuch, and that we holde this article negatiuelie. Wee holde that Chriſt deſcended into Hell, and ſuffered all his torments for our redemption, which I haue beene taught to be an affirmatiue, by better Logicians, then Doctor Hill. But one tolde you, that *Thomas Aquinas* did inſert this article: A diſcreet Paſtor, would haue admoniſhed one man rather priuatlie: then haue troubled ſuch an aſſemblie with ſuch a doubt in publick. Whoſoeuer hee was that tolde you that, hee learned it not by anie negatiue that wee holde, but of one of your Doctors. *Eraſmus* is the firſt that euer I heard bring that in queſtion, a man on your ſide, and one of your cheef ankers. Calvine in his booke of the Inſtitution of Chriſtian Religion ſaieth, that ſome are of that judgement, moſte likelie noting him, and men that followed his opinion. But how-ſo-euer it came, there hee proves it to bee an article, both conſonant and agreeable to the Scriptures, and neceſſarie to the perfection of the Symboll of our Faith. Therefore, Maiſter Doctor, you doe not well, to lay the faultes of your owne favorites and freendes, to our charges.

It

It was the improbabilitie of your opinion, that droue a man of ſo much judgement as *Eraſmus* was, to make that doubt. But *Carlill* and *Servetus* you ſay do denie it. In your printed ſermon, as you call it, you lay your malice more open. There you alledge for this antiquitie joined with veritie, (ſo there you call your owne opinion) all the learned of all ages, old and new: all the Prophetes and Apoſtles, and ſybilles of the heathen: all the creatures in heauen & earth, liuing and dead: and laſtlie, all the Divels thẽſelues. Onelie ſome poſſeſſed (you ſay) with Divels, as the Iewes, *Servetus* and *Carlill* denie it. Heere you vtter your choller more plainelie, challenging to your owne ſide, all the learned of all ages, olde and newe, and leauing nothing to your aduerſaries, but block-iſme, dol-tiſme, and diueliſh giddineſſe. But, (God bee thanked) you haue not the diſpoſing of gifts and ſpirits. There be men that denyes your opinion to haue anie ground in the word, as farre excelling you in all kindes of learning, as you count your ſelf before Sir *Thomas* your Curat at Gooſage: and of ſuch zeale and conſtancy in Gods cauſe, with out regard of wordlie preferments, as I pray God a man that can holde two benefices, and would haue ſeauen if he could get them, might mend that faulte: and ſhew himſelf as farre from Diueliſh giddineſſe, as they. As for *Servetus*, I neuer ſaw his book, which Calvine in his Epiſtles doth ſay, was printed at *Vienna*. But this I know, that he held many groſſe errors, concerning the Trinitie, Humanitie, and Deitie of Chriſt: as it is apparent in an Epiſtle written by the Miniſters of Baſil, to the Syndicks and ſenate of Geneva. As for this queſtion, I know not what he held but it is not likelie, that euer he touched it. And this I am ſure of, that he was burned, by the greateſt favorites of our opinion, I meane the Genevites.

Carlill, (excepting his fault) was a man for iudgement and learning, manie degrees before your ſelfe. He made a ſlip, indeede, as who hath not? Though you throwe the firſt ſtone at him, you are not cleare your ſelf. Beſides the mani- ſlips made in this booke, and other pulpits alſo: you taught on S. Iames his day in *Trubridge Anno* 1591. If I do wel remember the yeare, that weomen did beare children without pain, in time of innocencie. And becauſe you would be ſure not to be miſtaken, you did repeate it in the after noone, in the ſame tearmes that you ſpake it in the fore-noone: a fault of leſſe iudgement and learning then *Carlils* was. The Iewes bee enemies to our faith, and therefore doe not meete with vs, nor acknowledge the truth that we do holde in this article. As for the place that they take from you in the Hebrew Pſalme, and wherupon your choller doth riſe, I ſee no cauſe why they are not to bee beleeued in their owne tougue, before all others that haue learned that tongue of them. Their opinion of thoſe words (if they be taken right) doth impeach Chriſts paſsion, not ſo much as your own: what euer it pleaſeth you and Æpinus, to dreame and ſuſpect, without cauſe and matter. But vpon the Iewes, the enemies of our faith, & *Servetus* an Hereticke, with *Carlill*, whome for his fault, (not ſo foule as your owne) you boldlie and peremptorlie tearme poſſeſſed with a Diuell, in this place, you would faine lay the firſte broaching of our opinion, to deceaue the ſimple. I hope you will leaue this craft one day. Howſoeuer you may purcheſſe a plauſe amongeſt the ignorant, the wiſe and learned will hiſſe you out of the ſchooles, if you runne this courſe, as you haue begunne.

HVME *his* 17. *Sect.*

THey ſay that you preached the ſame at *Leycock*, condemning all men that diſſent from you, of furie and madneſſe, as men fighting againſt the holie Ghoſt, and ſpurning at a doctrine ſo profitable, ſo godlie, ſo wholeſome, and ſo full of all comfort, and ſolace. Heere M. Hill, I appeale to your owne conſcience, what profite, what commoditie, what health, ſafetie or ſolace, is in your opinion, that ours compriſeth not? Seeing our whole ſolace and ſafetie, comfort and commoditie, conſiſteth in this, that we vnderſtand that Chriſt, God and man, hath take vpon him our curſe, and paying a full ranſome for our ſinnes vpon the Croſſe, hath reconciled vs to the loue of his Farher, which we had loſte by our Father *Adam*, that nowe wee aſſure our ſelues of heauen, without all feare of Hell. What either comfort or commoditie, can the ſending of Chriſt into a place, where ther was left no comfort nor commoditye, adde to this ſo perfite, and full a joy? All good men are ſorie, that you, carrying the commendation of zeale and learning, haue joined your ſelfe with *M. Chalſont*, who enterpriſed this matter ſo vnaduiſedly (to ſay no worſe) and hath almoſt ſhaken the foundation of the Church, (which God forbid) with a dangerous diviſion. Your ſide (I confeſſe) hath manie great defendants, which doe rather ſpeake for you, then confirme your opinion, either with ſcripture, or reaſon. I was my ſelf of your opinion, till the fway of truth, (which I haue alwaies rather followed, then mine owne fantaſies) did carie mee to the contrarie. I am perſwaded, that manie of your authors, if they had heard the reaſons that you heare, would neuer haue ſaid, as you doe. But becauſe the

ignorant may not think, that you haue all the world on your ſide. Whether you regarde the nomber or the excellencie of the men: our cauſe is nothing inferiour to yours. As for *M. Wiſedome*, if he had erred, it had beene more Chriſtian-like, to haue confuted him by priuate conference. But ſeeing his doctrine hath the conſent of moſt of the learned of our times, and is ſo fortreſſed with Scripture and reaſon as heere you ſee: it wanteth all excuſe of modeſtie to handle him in open audience, before ſuch a multitude in ſuch ſort, as *M. Chalfont* did, and you confirmed in action, though not in words. For my part, I am, and will be on his ſide, till I heere better reaſon from you. Which when it commeth, it ſhal carie me to anie truth, that you can proue. Further, I wil not wagge the bredth of a naile. If you can plainelie without cloak and colour, confute my reaſons and confirm your owne: I promiſe you to turne my ſong If otherwaies, I hope you will bee as good as that word which you paſt in the pulpite, before ſo manie witneſſes. If you will ſatisfie mee, you muſt anſwere me by writing. For ſpoken words paſſe faſter away, then my dull ſenſes can digeſt the reaſons. I wrote this in Latine, becauſe I wold not haue it vnderſtood of the common ſort. I tranſlated it into Engliſhe, at the ſute of a Gentleman, that lay heer the laſt ſpring. That copie (by ſome negligence,) went farther abroad, then I was willing. I left it with a freend or two, to deliuer it to you, when I went in Scotland. They conferring together, delayed it till my returne leaſt I might ſeeme to haue fled the brunt of your anſwere. I am ſorie that it fell out ſo. For (God is my witneſſe) I ſought not mine own praiſe, but did ſeek the truth. Excuſe my raſhe enterpriſe in writing to you without anie acquaintance. Let my loue of the truth, which pricked mee for-warde, and your challenge

lenge which set mee a worke, excuse that fault, if it was anie. Far-well in the Lorde. God giue vs al vnderstanding hearts.

Your freend though vnacquainted,
ALEXANDER HVME.

HIL *his Reply.*

The Paralogisme of this section.

584 Truth it is, I did preach since a Leicock, & because I hard that M. Wisdome had set that opinion of yours abroche againe at Cosham, I did heere also confieme mine, not because 585 I am desirous to be contentious, but because I would haue no 586 Christian man to doubt of the articles of his Faith. you aske me what comfor able or necessarye matter you denye, that wee doe preach. I am were 587 and I pray you consider of it. 588 wee are borne in sinne: how are we deliuered from sinne but by Christ, which was conceiued by the holy Ghoste. 589 wee haue the magnitude of sinnes with Peter, 590 the multitude of sins with Mary Magdalen the turpitude of sins with the woman taken in adultery, the infamy of sinnes with the Publican: the diuturnity of sinnes with the theefe on the gallowes: the cruelty of sinnes with paule, and the recidiuation into sinnes with diuers of the Saints: yet if wee repent wee are pardoned for Christes sake, who purely, perfectly, & perpetualy obeyed the law of God. 591 By reason of our sins we ar subiect to al punishmets both corporal, and spiritual, and to the wrath of God: All the punishments due to vs did Christ suffer vpon the crosse, both in body and soul, and therfore it is called his Passion. He suffered in the Garden, in Annas and Caiphas house, in Pilats hal, but vpon the crosse (as you say truly) he suffered the agonies of death & tormenets of hell. 592 Further by reason of sin this

584. Then you denie not but that you cõdemned all your aduersaries of fury & madnes.

585. You hard lie winde frõ that suspition

586. Did M. Wisdom perswade men to doubt?

587. *Arrigeans res Pamphilo.*

588. That we teach also.

589 And that if not do ob-que die, yet as rude.

590. And that

591. And that

592. And that

was laide vpon the first Parentes, Thou shalt die the death: so by reason of this sentence, not only the body was condemned to death, but the soul to damnation. 593 To deliuer vs from these two punishments, the soule of Christ went to hell and returned, and the body of Christ that lay dead in the graue, rose again mightily, naturallye, speedily and happely. 594 Beesides, Christ rose in deede, 595 he gaue himselfe to be felte and handled, hereupon wee are assured that he conquered death and hell. 596 He ascended into Heauen, and therfore our praiers are hard, when we pray vnto him, 597 and he giueth vs gifts for our ministry, 598 and so he shall come to iudgement at the last day, to giue vs perfect blessednes. You confesse that Christ was borne in deede, liued and fulfiled the law, in the likenes of our flesh (sinne excepted) he dyed in deede, he was buried in deede, 599 he rose and ascended in deede, 600 and yet you will not confesse that he personalye descended. How can al these articles going before, and comming after be vnderstode of the person of Christ, and of his humanity, 601 & not this. Therefore you denying this 602 personall descending of Christ into hell, 603 take away the greate comfort of our deliuerance from hell. You say we are deliuered from hell by Christs 604 death: so are we too by his birth. 605 For if Christ had not bene borne he had not dyed: so if there had not beene a seperation of the body and soule of Christ, 606 he could neuer haue conquered death or hell: for by descending into 607 the graue, and that personally, he conquered death, & hath deliuered vs from death, 608 & by going downe into hell personallye, he hath conquered hel. And for this cause, the scripture applieth

593. There is the difference that we teach not: but wee teach another thing far more comfortable, that Christ descended into all the torments of hell, to quite vs of them: by that he deliuered vs from Hell.

594 595. 596. 597. 598. All that we teach as wel as you

599. And that he descended into hell indeede: why past you by that? aha D. aha D

600. Wee neuer denied that: speak truth for shame.

601. Fie man: who sayes so?

602. You slander.

603. We take not away that comfort.

604. And by his descending into hell.

605. So you may say, that we are deliuered by Adam: if he had neuer sinned, we had neuer needed Christ. 606. He conquered when he conflicted; and he conflicted before the separation. 607. 608. This Diuinitie is scarse currant, see the answere.

eth it to the death of Christ, 609 because death was (as Paul saith, Phil.3. A dissoluiton of body and soule And these 2. parts being dissolued, Christ came from the graue and from hel, 610 and Christ did conquer both, and triumph ouer them in him self, as it is Col. 2.15. These Iewes do aske a signe from heauen, 611 Math.22,38. Luk.11.29. to whom Christ said, A wicked and addulterous Generation doeth aske a signe, but no signe shal be giuen them, but the signe of *Ionas* the prophet, for as *Ionas* was in the whales belly three dayes and three nights: so shall the sonne of man bee in the hart of the earth, three daies and three nights. Which words Basilius Magnus interpreteth very wel. These words (a signe) is a matter made manifest cõteyning ẏ declaration of some thing that was hidden as ẏ signe of Ionas, representeth ẏ 612 descending of Christ into hell, and the resurrection of Christ, and as Bede saith, 613 (Rhab. also, he gaue thẽ a sign, but not from heauen, because they were vnworthy to see it, but from the depth of hel: Therefore (M. Hume) this is a most comfortable doctrine, that 614 Christ doth deliuer vs from hell: which albeit you agnise as well as wee, 615 yet because you deny the meanes where by it was purchased, you deny a most comfortable doctrine: for not only the body of Christ was in the heart of the earth, 616 but the son of man, which signifieth the whole humanitye, that is, the soule and the body. Ionas was in the whales belly aliue and yet came forth, Christ was in the graue dead in flesh, 617 and aliue in hel, and yet came forth. 618 Therefore to take away this maner of descending, taketh away from the Church a singular comfort, 619 and openeth a gap to many errors confuted already by the Fathers. For, if Christ did conquer hel, by the power of the 620 Godhead only, and not as he is a man, what neede had he to take vpon him our nature? but be-

609. Not so: but because in death he conflicted with these enemies.
610. This is like the 606.
611. This is superfluous.
612, 613. take *inferi* for the dead, & these men turne not this text to your byas
614. That is not the thing you promised We teach that as wel as you.
615. We deny it not, see the answere.
616. Simplie say you: without a figure, if you do, I deny it.
617. *Petitio principij.*
618. I denie the argumẽt.
619. It followes not.
620. That is your dreame

because as man he might be Lord not of heauen, and the Angels, but of the earth and of the inhabitants therof, and of hell and the diuels. 621 You say the world is sory for me. In the world saith Christ you shal haue affliction. And he telleth me the world wil hate me. I way not these things: 622 for I am noe man-pleaser, nor louer of the world. But if in my Sermon I had disagreed with Dauid; Ezechiel, Esay, Peter, Paule, & Christ himselfe 923 as you haue done in your answere, I hope I should be both sory 624 and ashamed. Touching M. Chalfont whome you terme a man without iudgement, and that he spake impudently and enuiously, I neuer sawe him before that time and but once sence. but by that speech and conference which I had with him I found him to be learned 625 and void of gall. Such of his neighbours as I haue talked with, did giue him ỳ deserued praise of a learned and honest man. And for asmuch as hee hath preached 926 sound doctrine in preaching the affirmatiue, and that doctrin which is allowed by the learned conuocation of this land, it doth not become you to 627 lible against him. for in speaking against him 628 you traduce al those reuerend and learned men, which made an Iniunction for keeping of vnitie that no other Catechisme should bee taught of any Schoolmaister then M. Nowels. Therefore becaus you are 629 a strãger you ought not to be 630 *peruersus* & speak euil of those Ministers which vphold the doctrine 631 established: and because you are a Schole-maister, you ought to teache and not to gainsaye it. *Qui pergit dicere ea, quæ vult, audiet ea, quæ non vult.* as you reuile at M. Chalfont, so doo 632 you and your frends priuily against me, calling me a Bishops pling and a time-seruer. 633 Indeed I was brought vp

621. I saide *Ỳ dolent.*
622. If you be. I would you were not.
623. Wordes, see the answere.
624. But you can not deny it.
625. His learning I will not meddle with, But if you had enquired, how he vsed that good soul M. Wisedome: you might haue seen his gale runne ouer
626. That is the question.
627. Can a priuate letter be a libel.?
628. Fancie. They take neither your part nor his.
629. I am no stranger in the church of Christ
630. Let the that know me better then you be asked if this be true.
631. Your opinion is not established.
632. Is truth a reuciling? 633. Tell when, where, and before whome I said so, if you can.

vp vnder 634 Maiſter Iewell, who catechiſed me in this faith, wherefore I will not, eaſily or rathly depart from it. I confeſſe my ſelfe alſo to be a timeſer ver, 636 for it is the day and time of ſaluation accepted, let them murmur with Martin that liſte: I pray God my dayes may end with this time, and my time ma continue no longer then theſe dayes of the ſtate of our Church, that now is to continue. I haue ſeene the beginning, 637 I haue ſeene the propagation of the Goſpell, I haue ſeene God hath defended our Church merciful & miraculouſly from heauen. God grant that I and all my Auditors may walk worthy of our calling, Godly, iuſtly, & ſoberly. Therefore I end with this ſaying of S. Paule 1. Cor. 4. 3. As touching me I paſſe very little to be iudged of you, or of mans iudgement. and in the 5. verſe, Therefore iudge nothing before the time vntill the Lord come, who ſhall lighten things that are hidden in darknes, and make the counſels of the hart manifeſt, and then ſhall euery man haue praiſe of God.

634. You did well to put that in print: but *bene ſit, Virtute decet non ſanguine niti.*

635. I ſcarſe thinke it

636. There was neuer worſe time you haue laid me ſo faſt a ſleep, with this ſalabie, that now they dreame, that there is neither heauen nor hell: God nor Deuill: That Moſes was a Politican, and Chriſt a deceauer. Are theſe your dayes of ſalvation? Theſe are the times that Paull did prophecie of 2. Tim. 3. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5 and Peter 2. Epiſt. 3. 3. and of which Chriſt ſaith the elect ſhould be deceaued if it were poſsible. Matth 24. 24. Praiſe them as much as you will.

637. You haue ſeene the beginning, but ſmal propagation. Men were glader of the Goſpell in the beginning, then now: the fault muſt needes be in the teachers. I leaue that to your ſelues. God giue you hartes to mend in wrod and work:.

HVME *his Reioynder to the* 17. *Section.*

TRuth it is that you did preach ſince at *Leycecke*, not for contentions ſake, but to haue the laſte word. For, hearing that *M. Wiſedom* had broached his opinion at *Coſham*, and had perſwaded Chriſtian men to doubt of the articles of their faith, (ſo your words

words do ſound) you could not holde your fingers. For my parte, I am much in your fauour. For you were content to ſee mee miſuſe all the Prophetes & Apoſtles, and Chriſt himſelfe, and would not haue ſaid to mee ſo much as black is my eie, if ſome vnruelie tongues blemiſhing your credite, had not ſet you a worke. But blab it is, and out it muſt. You excuſed M. Wiſedom of this fault, in the beginning of your ſermon at *Chippenhame*, and accuſed him againe (vnawares) in the end of it. In the laſt ſection, you ſay, that you ſpake that of *Carlill*, *Servetus*, and ſome that tolde you, that *Thomas Aquinas* did inſert this article: and now againe (vnaduiſedlie) you ſay heer, that you preached againe at *Leycocke*, after that you had heard of M. Wiſedomes preaching at Coſham, becauſe you would haue no Chriſtian man, to doubt of the articles of his faith. If this ſermon to this end was need-full in your eies: Then in your conceit M. Wiſedome had taught men at Coſham, to doubt of the articles of their Faith: contrarie to your firſt ſermon at Cippenhame, and your laſte ſection heere. *Carlil* and *Servetus* did help to couer this ſlip before. Now, what cloak will you finde, to hide this contradiction againe? My ſimple head cannot ſound into the depth of your excuſes: and therfore, I leaue it to your ſelf to prooue, that this ſlip did leape ouer the hatch, againſt your will. Now, you ſay, that I do ask you what comfortable or neceſſary matter you teach that we denie. To this (with proteſtation præmiſed) that I marke it conſideratlie, as though you woulde not let one ſillable fall in waſte: you begin a long diſcours of the magnitude, multitude, turpitude, &c of our ſinnes, and of Chriſts paines for our pardon, of his reſurrection, aſcenſion, and many other things which wee acknowledge, as well as you: all which, while my eares prepared by your proteſtation, did

hear-

hearken for the promised comfort we teach not: at length commeth out, that we beeing subiect to two great curses, death and damnation, Christ descended into the graue to deliuer vs from the one, and into Hell to deliuer vs from the other. This is right *Parturiunt montes*. That Christ went downe into Hell, is not our comfort. Our comfort is, that he hath deliuered vs from the bands of hell, which we teach & acknowledge as wel as you. But if this your doctrine be true, then is it false that Peter teacheth 2.24. that Christ bare our sinnes in his bodie on the tree, and his sacrifice vnperfect. Wherefore to conclude, *magnus nugator, magno conatu, magnas nobis nugas parit*. But (say you) though we agnise this (that is your tearm) as well as you. Yet because wee denie the meane thereof, wee denie a moste comfortable doctrine. The meane of our salvation was not his going down into the Hell of the damned, which wee denye: nor the laying of him vp three daies in Iosephs tombe which we confesse. But his suffering in his innocent soule and bodie, al the torments and miseries of hel and death; which wee must haue suffered, if hee had not stept in betweene vs and them. I will not onelie say this (after your manner) but I will proue it so sufficientlie, that you your self, shall not gainesay it.

The meane of our salvation, was the conquest of Hell and death: But his going downe into the Hell of the damned and Iosephs tomb, was not that conquest: *Ergo*, his going downe into the hell of the dāned, or Iosephs tombe, was not the meane of our salvation. Another.

The meane of our salvation, was that immaculate sacrifice that Christ did offer for our sinnes: But his descending into the hell of the damned, and Iosephs tombe, was not that sacrifice: *Ergo*, his going down into the hell of the damned, and Iosephs tomb, was

not the meane of our ſalvation.

Another.

There Chriſt redeemed vs where hee paide the ranſome of our redemption: But hee paide not the ranſome of our redemption in the hell of the damned, and Ioſephs tombe. *Ergo*, hee redeemed vs not by deſcending into the hell of the damned, nor Ioſephs tombe.

Heer be three reaſons in mood and figure, againſt your comfortable doctrine, which when you haue anſwered, I will bring a whole armie of ſuch mighty ſouldiers, (for the ſcriptures haue enough ſuch) to turne your comfort into murning, and your joy into teares, if it ſtand on no better ground then this. But ſay you, if all the articles going before and comming after, bee vnderſtood of Chriſts perſon: then this article of his deſcending muſte carie the ſame ſenſe: But the firſt is true: *Ergo*, the laſt is alſo true. This is a good argument, but the concluſion is not for your hand. If you had but one ſuch for your maine-ſhot of deſcending, a whole reame of paper royall, would bee too little for your amplifications. But heer your malice driving you to imagine much abſurditie in our opinion, doeth deceaue you. For wee holde and will die for it, that Chriſt in his owne perſon bodie and ſoule, did deſcend into all the torments, that hel could yeelde. And this indeede is a true deſcending into Hell. For the nature and name of Hell, doth yeeld nothing but horrour, terror, trébling and torments. But in your opinion, we muſt imagine all things contrarie. Not torments, but triumph: not ſorrowes, but ſolace: not ſhame and ignominie, but honour and glory. Hell doeth yeelde no ſuch frutes, nor the deſcending into hell, can bee to no ſuch ende. Take therefore your potentiall deſcending into Hell, and the conqueſt thereof by the

onelie

onlie power of the Deitie, and buy a benefice with it. Whereas you ſay that our opinion doeth open a gap to manie errors: you pretend a feare without groũd, to make the Reader affraied of the moone-ſhade. It is the manner of politick men, that would faine hinder a thing, that reaſon doeth further, to ſet feare of ſequels againſt the force of known reaſon. Heer you flee to that ſhift, though you know, that amongeſt al the writers, that haue embraced this opinion (which be manie, & of great name) not one yet can be rainted with one error growing in this fountaine. In this ſection you hamper about another argument, but cannot hit the marke. Wherefore to ſaue your labour, I will heere make it vp, and breake the point of it, when I haue done, that you may ſee it cannot hurt vs. It is this. There is greater reaſon that Chriſt ſhould haue beene held three daies of Hell without paine: then three daies of the graue without corruption. But hee was three dayes in the graue without corruption. *Ergo*, he was farre rather thre daies in Hell without paine. Becauſe it is not likelie, that the weaker did faſten faſter on him, then the ſtronger: beeing as far inferiour in malice, as it is leſſe in power. To this I anſwere, that there is not the like reaſon, much leſſe greater reaſon. For, hee lay three dayes in the graue to confirme our knowledge, and to extinguiſhe all doubt of his death. Secondlie, to lay a grounded beleef in our hearts of the reſurrection: For, he was the firſt frutes of the dead. Thirdlie, to make his reſurrection more glorious. For the lõger he was held in the bandes of death, the greater glorie it was to breake them, gathering ſtrength by continuance. Laſtlie, to take all blockes out of the path of faith, that wee might walke in it more ſurelie, without ſtumbling. I knowe no ſuch reaſons why he ſhould haue deſcended into the very place of

hell being ſo farre remooued from our ſenſes, as we could receiue neither knowledge nor comfort therby. Now, whereas you take mee vp, for ſaying that the world is ſorrie for you: my wordes might haue had a tollerable conſtruction, if you had caſt an eie to Chriſts words in Iohn. God ſo loued the worlde that hee gaue his onelie begotten Sonne for it: or if you had lookt in my latine: you ſhould haue found my wordes leſſe ſubject to violence. *Piy omnes dolent*, that is, al the godlie are ſorie, ſounding much to the ſame ſenſe. But you loue not the world (you ſay) nor the world loues not you: I think you ſpeake truelie. iiij. or v. benefices to them that you haue, wold ſerue the turne, to maintaine your skarlet hood, and half a doſen of tall fellowes in tawnie coates, to defend that with the ſword, which you cannot with the pen & that is but a peece of the world. But you loue not the world becauſe it is not ſo liberall: nor the world loues not you ſo, becaus you haue more charges already, thē you haue tongues to teach. You cōclude that I beeing a ſtranger muſte not bee *periergos*, and that *Si pergam dicere, quæ volo: audiam, quæ nolo.* Theſe arguments were better in Queen Maries fierie daies for D. Storie, then they are now in the calmes of Elizabeth, for D. Hill. You ſlander the learned convocation of the land, and wrong good M. Nowell, who, (as I heare) diſclaimeth your opinion. As for mee, I am a Chriſtian, and therefore no ſtranger in the Church of Chriſt. I will not ſpeake againſt my conſcience, for all the counſels and convocations in the world, and all the Doctors in both the Vniuerſities, if they were my aduerſaries. But (God bee thanked) it is not ſo. I began with you in ſecrete, & you haue made it common. Wherefore you are *periergos* and not I.

HIL *his conclusion to M. Hume.*

MAister Hume, in the latter end of your answere you request mee to recant: if your answere did please mee, as it doth you: I would be as willing to recant, as you and your freends would be glade to heare it. But I will plainelie set downe my reasons why I doe not recant: The first is, I alledged Act. 2 and proued out of Peters sermon my assertion, and to the reasons I drew out of that place, you haue answered nothing. Secondlie, I alledged Syra, 17. 21. To proue, that this phrase, (the nethermost parts of the earth) doth signifie hell, to this you haue in like manner saide nothing. Thirdlie, in all your answeres to my allegations, you haue disagreed with the word of God. In answering of the 16. Psal. you say my allegation is to be understood of the passion of Christ: And Peter Act. 2. saith, it is spoken of the resurrection, whether is to bee beleeued of Peter or you, I referre it to the indifferent Reader. Then I proued that ERETS TACHTITH, that is, (the nethermost partes of the earth) did signifie hell, out of the 63. Psalm and 9. verse. In answering of this you dissent from David, and M. Calvine. Now, whether it be more safe to followe Dauid or you, let mine enemies iudge. I alleadged Ezechiel to proue that point also 31. chapter. 5. 16. 17. 18. 19. In answering to that place, you haue gain-saide Ezechiel, Esay in his 14. chapter Lavaterus, Munster, and Pellicane. Now, whether it be more fit for mee to beleeue you or Esay, or Ezechiel, let your owne fauorites iudge. Then I alleadged the known place of Peter, you trauailed much about this place, yet in your interpretation of this word *pneumasi*, that is (spirits) which you interprete the soules of the men that liued in Noahs

time, you contradict the words of our Sauiour, Luk 24 39. For Christ saieth, a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me haue. And yet you, and your Maisters ay, that this word spirit may signifie a mã liuing. Now, whether it bee more expedient for mee to beleeue you, or Christ, I referre it to your owne iudgement. You said my Sermon at Chippenhame did confirme you, and your frends: but I hope your owne answeres will not conuute mee, but your selfe, and cause your self, and them both to recant: you say you seeke to know the truth: so do I, (as knoweth the knower of all hearts): wherefore, whether you or I haue taught the trueth, let not Hume nor Hill iudge, but the learned of the Vniuersities. For, as Paule saith. 1. Cor. 14. 32. The spirits of the Prophets are subiect to the Propheres. That is, the labors of the learned men, are to be iudged of the learned. The God of patience and consolation, giue vs grace, that we may be like minded one towards another according to Christ Iesus, that we may with one minde, & one mouth, glorifie God the Father of our Lord Iesus Christ. Rom. 14. 5. 6. To whome bee all honour & glorie, world without end. *Amen.*

An answere to the conclusion.

IF you had been the man that you professed in the pulpite, and I promised my selfe, when I wrote: there was good hope, that my answere might haue pleased you, as wel as mee. But now I see it impossible to please you, except I could sing your song. And truelie M. D. I could sing your song as soone as anie mans, if it did tune as wel with the concent of scriptures, as other mens doe. But now you must pardon me: I am too old to learn your discords. The things in my answere, which I hoped might haue wrought

at

it favour with you, was truth and reaſon. But nowe I ſee, the one is a ſtranger with you, and the other a gueſt at will. If they had beene of that account in your ſtudie, and ſo familiar with you, as I hoped: my poore anſwere had not found ſuch hard handling, nor vnreaſonable railing there, as it did. You ſent it home ſo ragged, rent, and torne: that it coſte mee a moneths work in the cold winter, to mend his coat. Now, I haue quilted it better, & ſent it to you once againe, to challenge your promiſe, and to tell you that your plaine reaſons heere ſet downe, why you could not recant are nullified and made of none effect: like an obligation, that is paied at the day appointed. Wherefore, ſeeing your argument drawne from the Act. 2. is anſwered ſect. 4. and ſect. 7. And ſeeing your place out of Syrach is 7. waies defaced ſect. 11. And ſeeing I haue proued my conſent with the Scriptures in euerie place, where I met with that accuſation. And ſeeing our ſenſe of the 16. Pſalm, agreeth with Peter as wel as yours, ſect. 7. And ſeeing in my anſwere to Pſal. 63. I diſſent neither from David nor Calvine, ſect 8. And ſeeing in my anſwere to the place of Ezechiel, I diſſent neither from him nor Eſay. ſect. 9. And ſeeing I haue proued by the worde (ſpirit) that men living in the fleſhe are not ſignified ſect. 12. And ſeeing now I haue ſet down your words according to your owne requeſt: and ſeeing your ſermon at Chippenhame, and this anwſere alſo, hath confirmed mee: and ſeeing mine own anſwere doth not offer me, nor anie of my freends ſufficient cauſe to recant. I hope now you are ſatisfied, and that you will ſatisfie me, and the populous congregation, to whome you made your ſolemne promiſe of recantation in the pulpite at Chippenhame. It was not a place to diſſemble in, and therefore let vs ſee that

you meant as you ſpake. The Lord giue you a hart pliable to his truth.

AND heere to end, as if M. D. had ſet the bent of his wit to ſhewe the vanitie of his worke, he maketh the vaineſt bragge, that euer grewe in a vaine heade. There was (good Reader) if thou knowe it not) one *Ovid*, of all vaine poets the vaineſt. Amongeſt manie filthie, and vaine workes, he wrote a booke entituled *Metamorphoſis*. In it he ſets the edge of all his wits (which he had as ſharp as euer had anie Poet) to the painting of lies in all coloures wherein he ſhot ſo neare the marke, that in compariſon of it, the lying legend commes not neere the whetſtone, by as manie myles as there be wordes in them both. The concluſion of this worthie worke, M.D. hath paſted to his hel, as moſt agreable to that argument.

Iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iouis ira, nec ignis,
Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetuſtas.

In which *Ovid* looking back into the worke of his owne wit, grew into ſuch loue with the fineneſſe of his owne conceits, that he doubted not to defie his owne imagined God *Iuppiter*. Now, that thou migh teſt ſee (gentle reader) that M. Doctor did thinke of his owne worke, as well as *Ovid* coulde of his: hee bruſteth out in the ſame brag. In which, if he meane Ovids Idole by this *Iuppiter*, it is heathniſhe, if the true God, it is Helliſhe. That they that vnderſtand not the latine, may vnderſtand it, I haue thought

not

not amiſſe to engliſhe it as neere the words as I can keeping the engliſh meeter.

I haue at length made vp thiswork,
Which Iuppiter in raging fume:
With ire, with fire, with edged ſworde,
And cankering age cannot conſume.

To it I may well anſwere out of another Poet.

Quid dignum tanto fert hic promiſſor hiatu,
Parturiunt montes, naſcetur ridiculus mus.

That is,
What hath this vaunting bragger done
Worth gaping mouth and lips ſo wide:
The groning Hill is brought a bed
And out a ſillie mous doth ſlide.

Huic latino carmine ſic reſpondero.
Nondum eſt exactum: ludit tua gloria ventos,
Ad fata lucta vedi. Iam renovatur opus.
In cineres, fumoſque tui rediere labores,
Quod Iouis ignis agit, quod Iouis ira facit.
Aliud.
Dicere ſi bellum mireris tartara cœlo:
Fœdera Dis ſtygius cum Ioue nulla colit.
Aliud.
Chriſtum poſt ſtygios in triſti morte dolores,
Contendit ſtygias Hillus *adiſſe domos.*
Complexus vano nugas, tricaſque libello
Provocat inſanus tela, manumque Iouis.
Errat: ſi tutum Iouis ira acheronta putarit,
Non coquit æternis iguibus ille ſtygem?

FINIS.

CERTAINE PLACES QVO-

ted out of Maſter Doctors owne Authours, vpon the three principal places, where-upon *he buildeth this his opinion, wherein thou maiſt* ſee gentle Reader, how ſmall cauſe hee hath to *bragge of ſo many old and new writers. I leaning alto-*gether on the word of trueth, haue not quoted them in the treatiſe it ſelfe, counting them vnſufficient witneſſes in ſuch a cauſe, wherein they haue neither reveiled, nor experimented knowledg. yet becauſe I would not defraud them of their iudgments, I haue thought good to ſet them downe heere.

The firſt place is, thou wouldeſt not leaue my ſoule in ſhéol nor ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption, where M. Doctor takes Shéol to be hell, we the generall condition of them which are departed this life.

In Pſal. 16. MOLERVS, cæterum movent hic queſtionem de deſcenſu Chriſti ad inferos, quã prudens omitto: cum ex hoc loco id ſatis certo evinci non poſsit.

Felinus, non deſeres animam meã ſepulchro, id eſt, non deſtitues me, vt anima mea morti concedat. Per ſheolem enim quod ſepulchrum ſignificat (vt in Pſal 6. verſ 5. d. xi) ſtatum & conditionem mortuorum, hoc eſt inferos, ſcriptura tranſnominare ſolet.

In eundem Muſculus, non derelinques animam meam in ſepulchro, nec dabis ſanctum tuum videre corruptionem, quaſi dicat, tam certus ſum manſurum me perpetuo, vt vbi etiam mortuus fuero, in mortis tamen detineri nequeam: ideo quod, &c.

In eundem. Hemingius, on thi pſalme ſaith, Vis verborum hunc ſenſum vt à Petro docemur, ſuppeditat, non derelinques. id eſt, non ſines, animam meam, id eſt, me: in inferno, id eſt, ſepulchro permanere.

In eundem. Pomeranus, Quoniam non derelinques animam meam, id eſt, vitam meam, in inferno, id eſt in morte: Chriſtus non ſolum pro nobis mortuus eſt, ſed etiam voluit pro nobis aliquantiſper, id eſt, vſq; in tertium diẽ deſcendere ad tenebras tartareas, vbi eſt imago mortis, & ſicut Iob dicit ſempiternus horror abſque vllo ordine, hoc eſt voluit tam diu in morte teneri, ad quam nos eramus in Adam damnati.

damnati. ſic & Ioſeph de morte ſua loquitur, Gen. 37. deſcendam ad filium meum lugens in ſheol.

Theſe be fiue of M. Doctors principall Authors, all agreeing with vs, and contrary to himſelfe, theſe that followe indeed diſſent from vs: and agree not with him on the meaning of this place.

Æpinus the great ſuperintendent of Hamborough (as he calleth him) on this place ſaith. Veteres ex ſcripturis reſpondent diverſas apud inferos manſiones fuiſſe, beataſque animas à corpore ſeparatas ante Chriſti aſcenſionem, neque in terris manſiſſe, neque hinc ad ſuperos in cœlum migraſſe, ſed deſcendiſſe ad infernum. & huic ſententiæ ſuffragetur Eccleſiæ Catholicæ conſenſus, & accedat ſcripturæ ſacræ autoritas: retinebo hanc ſententiam donec certior ſcripturæ interpretatio adferatur, & hæc manifeſtis ſcripturæ teſtimonijs confuretur.

Peter Martyr in his common places holdeth the ſame in a manner. Et vero vna atque altera tum piorum, ſpirituum, tum eorum qui damnati eſſent, ſocietas Chriſti præſentiam perſenſit. Etenim fidelium ſpirituum, qui in loco tranquillo quieſcebant, qui ſinus Abrahæ appoſite dicitur, vt cum ſancto illo Patriarcha eadem fide præditi exſpectarent ſalutem per Chriſtum, qua ab Abrahamo denominabantur, ſpiritus inquam illi magna conſolatione exhilarati ſunt, Egeruntque Deo optimo maximo gratias, &c.

Loſius on this place ſaith. Chriſtus ad inferos vere poſt mortem deſcendit, ne nos ad eos deſcendamus. 2. vt inde Patriarchas vt vetus credidit eccleſiæ ſecum abduceret, cum quibus poſtea cum triumpho in cœlum aſcendit.

Theſe three holdeth that the Fathers were in hell, though Martyr dare not giue it that name, but calles it a place of reſt and the boſome of Abraham, all which M. Doctor denieth.

Luther on this place tomo 3. of his workes. Sicut Chriſtus cum ſummo dolore mortuus eſt: ita videtur dolores in inferno poſt mortem ſuſtinuiſſe, vt nobis omnia ſuperaret. Ita ego interea verbis Petri inhærebo donec meliora doctus fuero.

To him agreeth Latimer in his Sermons. And theſe two holde that he ſuffered in hell, which Maſter Doctor denieth.

The ſecond place is in the 4. Epheſ. verſe 9. but that he aſcended, what is it but that he firſt deſcẽded into the lowermoſt parts of the earth.

Hemingius on this place saith. Porro, qui ex hoc loco descensum Christi ad inferos, & locum damnatorum cõcludunt parum firmo nituntur fundamento. Non enim comparationem instituit Apost. vnius partis terræ ad totam terram: sed totam terram cum cœlo confert.

Musculus on this place bringeth two senses indifferently, the last accordeth with this. Potest exponi de terra simpliciter, cujus partes sunt respectu cœli inferiores. This much agreeth with vs against our Doctor.

Musculus his other sense is this. Descendit ad nos in hunc mundum, ad sepulchrum, & ad inferos. descendit ad eos propter quos redimendos venit: & quousque illi in partibus terræ cum vivendo, tum moriendo ad inferiora demissi sunt: eousque ipse sese demisit, quo nos ex inferioribus secum ad superiora, vnde descendit, subveheret. Where hee disenteth also from this Doctor holding that he never descended farther than the Sancts of God doth, whome he came to redeeme, which was not I trowe so farre as the damneds hell.

Pelicanus on this place saith, Ascendit redivivus in sublime secum ducens victoriæ suæ trophæum captivorum gregem à peccati Diabolique tyrannide liberatum. Here he holdeth that he did carry the fathers vp to heauen, which our Doctor denieth.

Petrus Martyr de vtraque in Christo natura contra vbiquitarios. fol. 59. in typis Christophori Froschoveri apud Tygurinos. saith. Descendit ergo ad inferiora terræ, & ascendit super omnes cœlos, filius Dei, vt non solum legem Prophetasque compleret: sed & alias quasdam occultas dispensationes, quas solus ipse novit cum Patre. Neque enim scire possumus quomodo Angelis, & his, qui in inferno erant, sanguis Christi profuerit & tamen quin profuerit, nescire non possumus. Here this most excellent man avoucheth that Christs blood was profitable to them in hel, which our Doctor dare not say of the damned, howsoever Peter Martyr meant it.

The third place is out of the 1. Pet. 3. 18. 19. 20. *mortified in the flesh, & quickened in the spirit, in which spirit, hee went and preached to the spirits sometime disobedient in the daies of Noah, &c.*

Hemingius on this place saith. Patet quod carnis vocabulo tota humana natura Christi intelligatur: sicut & spiritus appellatione ejusdem divina natura.

And a little after he saith, Perperam quidam spiritus nomen ad animam tantum referunt contra apertum Pauli testimonium.

Æpinus vpon the 68. Psalme saith. Petrus non meminit animæ

separatæ

ſeparatæ à corpore ſed illius ſpiritus, quo tempore Nohæ incredulis prædicavit, nondum aſſumpta humana carne, & quo vivificatus reſurrexit à morte, qui ſpiritus Deus eſt. non rationalis anima. Deus enim ſuſcitavit eum ſolutis doloribus mortis. Act 2.13. nõ anima.

Aretius on this place ſaith. Ideo carnem accipio libenter pro tota humana natura Chriſti, quã aſſumpſit in vnitatem perſonæ. Contra. vivificatus eſt ſpiritu, hoc eſt ſecundum divinam naturam. *Pneuma* igitur eſt divina natura vt conſtet ſibi *antitheſis.*

Theſe three agree here with vs againſt this Doctor, that boſteth ſo much of their names.

Vitus Theodorus in the contents of the chapters of the firſt Epiſtle of Peter tranſlated into Latine by Selnecccr one of Maiſter Doctors authors ſaith ſingularis hæc eſt doctrina, & quæ alibi in ſcripturis nuſquã legitur. & quid Apoſtolus per eam intelligit, nondum perfecte ſcire licet. hoc certitudo eſt eum aliquot ſpiritibus prædicaſſe ſed quot, & quibus videbimus in æterna vita. Here this man denieth that which he ſuppoſeth to be ſpoken heere, to haue any other warrant in the word. & that it is not knowne to what ſpirits he preached contrary to our Doctor.

Pelicanus on this place. Per ſpiritum intelligo ſpiritum ſanctum datum Apoſtolis die Pentecoſtes: & per carcerem errores, & Idolatrias Gentium, & Iudæorum. Our Doctor by ſpirit vnderſtandeth the humane ſoule of Chriſt, by the priſon hell. This man (one of his owne authors) vnderſtandeth by ſpirit the holy Ghoſt, and by the priſon the errours wherein the ſoules of the Iewes and Gentiles were captiued.

Thus thou maiſt ſee (gentle Reader) that theſe three places, on which M. Doctor buildeth his opinion, his owne authors do interpret them ſome as we do, and ſome otherwaies than he himſelfe can allowe. wherefore thou maieſt well think, that this is a weake foundation to build thy faith vpon. Nowe I will note to thee howe his owne authors (that he calles his owne I meane) do diſſent from him, and one from another on the very article it ſelfe. Firſt all his old writers ſend Chriſt to hel to deliuer the fathers, and he to the hell of the damned where the fathers never were, and therefore no more of them.

Eraſmus in Catecheſi ſaith, Ipſa inconcinnitas ſermonis arguit ab alio quopiam inter textum Emblema. & paulo poſt. An Thomas Aquinas addiderit ſubdubito. Heere hee doubteth of the Article it ſelfe, and ſuppoſeth Thomas Aquinas to haue inſerted it.

Et poſtea. vetuſtiſſimi patres magna religione cavebant, ne quid aſſeverarent

asseverarent duntaxat in symbolo, quod non esset evidenter sacris literis vtriusque testamenti expressum. Tales sunt omnes articuli hoc vno excepto. Heere he denies it (meaning the common sense of it) to haue any sufficient warrant in the word.

Afterward gathering all the places of scripture that are alleadged by writers to confirme it he concludes. Nihil istorum est, quod tergiversatorem cogat credere Christi animam per se descendisse ad tartarum. And againe, in his multa sunt, quæ nihil habent ponderis: sed nullum est quod non vel allegoriæ nebulo sit obscurum, vel variam accipiat interpretationem. Heere he denies the sufficiencie of all the scriptures, that this man and all that went before him alledgeth, and yet this is one of his owne authours.

Petrus Martyr in symbolo, saith, Quantum ad animam ipsam attinet, statim atque ex corpore excessit, non mansit otiosa, sed descendit ad inferos, quod nihil aliud indicat, nisi quod eundem subijt statum, quem reliquæ animæ à corpore sejunctæ experiuntur. Heere this man saith that to descend into hell is nothing else, but to enter into that same state, that other souls do, when they are departed from the body, which our Doctor denies, and yet this is one of his Authors.

Felinus on the 16. Psalme saith, Non est in Davide adimpletum quod hic canitur. Anima enim ejus tandem ad inferos descendit, & vidit caro ejus foveam. Heere this man taketh the name of hell for the common condition of al the dead, which our Doctor denies: & yet this is one of his Authours.

Pomeranus on the 16. Psalme, having expounded the name sheol of the state of the dead as I haue quoted before concludes. Atq; hic habes articulum illum fidei, with many more wordes prooving that Christ hath wrought our deliverance by his death and not by descending into the hell of the damned. And yet this is one of Master Doctors best Authours.

Westmerus in tropis in voce, *infernus*, pag. 832. saith, Ad infernum descendere, nihil aliud est quam pessum ire, &c. And after in the same page. and page 833. ad infernum descendere est corpus sub terra recondi. vnde cum Christus descendisse ad inferos asseritur in symbolo vere mortuus, & sepultus esse intelligitur. Heere this man saith, that Christs descending into hell is meant but of his death, and burial. And yet this is one of M. Doctors authours.

Luther and Latimer holde, that Christ suffered in hell the torments of hel, as I haue quoted alreadie. This our Doctor denies, and yet these be two of his Authours.

Hipperius in his Catechisme. gathering the summe of this part of our faith thus saith. Primo dignatus est Christus se nostri causa humiliare

humiliare noſtram aſſumens naturam per omnia(ſi excipiamus peccatum) par nobis factus. ſecundo pro noſtris peccatis expiandis maximos cruciatus pertulit,& mortem ignominioſiſſimam Tertio quo donaremur iuſtitia à morte reſurrexit. quibus peractis priſtinam accepit gloriam,& aſcendit ad cœlos. Here this man ſhoulde-reth it quite out of his creed,and yet this is one of Maiſter Doctors Authours.

Loſſius on the 16.Pſalme ſaith, Deſcendit ad inferos totus Chriſtus ſive filius Dei,ſicut idem conceptus eſt de ſpiritu ſancto, natus ex Maria Virgine,crucifixus,mortuus,& ſepultus.

Hemingius in his Catechiſme hath the like. Chriſtus deſcendit ad inferos vtrum anima an corpore ſcriptura non dicit: ſed Symbolum videtur innuere totum Chriſtum deſcendiſſe. Heere theſe two men ſay that Chriſt deſcended into hell body and ſoull: our Doctor denies it: and yet theſe be two of his Authours.

Vrbanus Rhegius in Catechiſmo,ſaith, Secundum animam deſcendit ad inferna ad pias animas Adami, Noahi,Lothi, &c. Heere this man ſaith, that hee went into hell to the holy ſoules of Adam Noah,and Loth. our Doctor ſaith they were not there, and yet this is one of his Authours.

Æpinus on the 16. Pſalme ſaith. Quod autem Chriſtus latroni dixit hodie eris mecum in Paradiſo non abrogat fidem huic dogmati de deſcenſu Chriſti ad inferos: quia paradiſus illa de qua loquitur Chriſtus eo tempore apud inferos fuit,nunc autem apud ſuperos in cœlo eſt. Heere this man ſaith that Paradiſe was in hell before the comming of Chriſt: our doctor ſaith no,and yet this is one of his beſt Authours.

Lavaterus on Ezech 31.18. ſaith, *hades* apud Græcos generale vocabulum eſt tormentorum & quietis. This man ſaith, and ſaith it trulie,that the greeke name of hell, is a common name both to the place of the torments of the wicked,and the joyes of the faithfull. our Doctor denies that, and yet this is one of his cheefe Authours.

Aleſius on the 19. of Iohn vpon theſe wordes, *Exiuit in locum qui Caluaria dicitur*, orationem repetit luciani presbiteri Antiocheni vbi hæc habet. Adhibebo vobis loci ipſius teſtimonium adſtipulatur his ipſe in Hyeroſolimis locus,& Golgothana rupes ſub patibuli onere diſrupta. Antrum quoque illud quod avulſis inferni Ianuis corpus demum reddidit animatum, quo purius inde ferretur ad cœlum. Here this man maketh the place where Chriſt was buried the mouth of hell,meaning thereby the place of death, our Doctor denies that,and yet this is one of his Authors.

Aretius in the ninth of his common places, fol. 31. Sed de illo non ſatis conſtat,quamdiu apud inferos ſit commoratus: non diu vt

apparet, vt eadem die secundum animam ab inferis reversus, gloriosè Paradisum ingressus sit cum latrone. Heere this man saith that Christ was not one day in hell, M. Doctor saith that hee was there al the three daies, that he lay in the graue, and yet this is his chefest Authour.

Maister Nowell in his greater Catechisme saith, Christum, vt corpore in terræ viscera, Ita animam à corpore separata ad inferos descendisse, simulque etiam virtutis suæ virtutem atque efficacitatem ad mortuos, atque inferos adeo ipsos ita penetrasse, vt & incredulorum animæ acerbissimam justissimamque infidelitatis suæ damnationem, ipseque Satanas inferorum princeps tyrannidis suæ, & tenebrarum potestatem omnem debilitatam, fractam, atque ruina collapsam esse persentiret: Contra vero mortui Christo dum vixerunt fidentes, redemptionis suæ opus jam peractum esse, ejusq; vim, atque virtutem cum suavissima, certissimaque consolatione intelligerent atque perciperent. Heere (gentle Reader) because Maister Doctor wrongeth this good man, then whome the earth beareth not many, and (as I am perswaded) not any better, I pray thee mark this place well, for these are the onely wordes that M. Doctor challengeth in all his workes. First thou maist obserue, that he vseth the name (inferi) not for the damned onely but for al the dead: because he saith that by Christs descending *ad inferos*, both the wicked felt the justnes of their damnation, and the godly the sweetnes of their salvation. and so *Christus descendit ad inferos* is but Christ descended to the dead. Secondly that he saith not that Christs soule descended into the hell of the damned, as our Doctor doth: but that his soul being severed from his body, that is, beeing departed this life, he discended *ad inferos*, that is, was laid vp amongst them whose life was blotted out of the memory of the living. Thirdly, hee saith not that those, to whome he descended saw him there personally: but they felt and vnderstood the one their just damnation, the other their sweet salvation together with his descending to the dead that is presently vpon the dissolution of his soule and body. Wherefore great wrong hath our D. done this man, to wring his words being somewhat obscure to a sense that he never meant, and to brag of him as being the father of an opinion that I dare hope (for he is yet aliue) he doth disallow. His opinion is amongst all the godly allowed to be true though not so well fitting the article of the Creed: but our D. opinion no man accepteth yet for trueth, except it be himself and his favorities. Thus I haue set down, what jarring there is betweene this man, and his authors. Now I will shewe thee, how he hath pulled some into this braul, that never dealt in the matter to make his muster booke long ynough, & to feare men with naked names.

Roberg

Robert Samuell in the booke of Martyrs, making a confeſſion of his faith when he comes to this point, ſaith no more thã the words of the beleefe, which he meant as wel with vs, as with hun, and him he quotes for one.

Lambert in the ſame book handling the queſtion of the real preſence, quotes a place out of Aug. *ad Dardanum* to proue that Chriſt being corporally in heaven, is not corporally in the Sacrament: in which place being long, Aug. amongſt thoſe things, that Lambert quotes him for, ſaith that Chriſt according to his ſoule was in the bottome of hel (which if it be wel taken may be) was devoured and ſwallowed vp of death: but Lambert himſelfe neither alloweth nor diſtalloweth it, as being a thing beſide his queſtion: and yet hee is alleadged for one.

M. Fox writeth a litle Pamphlet intituled Chriſt triumphing, becauſe in it is diſplaied the greatnes of the battell, the worthines of the victory, & the joye of the conqueſt. The Printer (for I think M. Fox neuer cared greatly, what ſigne they hanged at his ſhop dore) or if it was M. Fox himſelfe, all is one, deviſed a picture to expreſſe the matter within the book. A man with foure wounds in his hands & feet, inveſted in a bright cloud, with a gliſtering flame, as it were of fame, & glory glimmering about his face, ſtanding with the one foot on the head of a Dragon: and the other on the heart of death. This picture M. Doctor tooke to be ſo ſure an argument of Chriſts deſcending into hell, that he not onely cauſeth to ſet it before his owne booke likewiſe: but alſo repeateth the name of M. Fox 4. times if not oftner, as favouring his opinion, hauing to my knowledge not one word in al his works, and I am ſure not one ſyllable in the book, which he quotes of Chriſt triumphing, ſaving that picture. Thus gentle Reader, I haue giuen thee a vewe of 23. of M. Doctors Authors, of whome ſome ſpeake againſt him, ſome differ from him, & ſome ſay nothing for him. wherefore thou maieſt conclude, that it is but a painted cauſe that alleadgeth pictures for arguments. there is not one of al the Authours, that he muſters ſo often: that agreeth with him in all things concerning this opinion. Cajetane a Cardinall of Rome writing vpon the place of Peter (If he had not ſcarred at his popiſh name) commeth neerer him than any of theſe, *Vt ipſe Chriſtus mortificatus carne (nam vere mortuus eſt ſecundum carnem) vivificatus autem ſpiritu (nam tunc cum mortuus erat vivificatus erat ſpiritu) vtpote beatus ſecundum ſpiritum, & triumphans de dæmonibus.* Here he hath his deſcending into hell, his triumphing over the Deuils, his being aliue when he was dead, and his fleſh for the body, & ſpirit for the humane ſoule. Therefore good Reader, let him follow Cajetan and follow thou the trueth.

FINIS.

A REJOYNDER TO DOCTOR HIL CONCERNING THE DESCENSE OF CHRIST INTO HELL

A

A REIOYNDER TO DOCTOR HIL CONCERNING *THE DESCENSE OF CHRIST* INTO HELL.

WHEREIN THE ANSWERE TO HIS SER- mon is juſtlie defended, and the rouſt of his reply ſcraped from thoſe arguments as cleanlie, as if they *had neuer bene touched with that canker.*

By *Alexander Hume*, Maiſter of Artes.

¶ HEERE, BESIDES THE REIOYNDER, thou haſt his Paralogiſmes: that is, his fallacies and deceits in reaſon pointed out, and numbered in the margin: amounting to the nomber of 600. and aboue; and yet not half reckoned.

know is of contrary, or diuers things, as in this place you see, in killed and quickned.) now how both these were true at on time, 379 S. Peter doth shew, for at the 380 same time, he was dead as concerning his body, he was aliue in spirit, that is in soule: 381 for the soule seperate from the body, is aptly called a spirite. Eccle. 12. 7. And dust returne to earth as it was, and the spirite returne to God that gaue it. So is it taken, Heb. 12. 23. Act. 7. 49. and 382 so doth this word signifie in this place: 383 for Christ was not killed both in body and soule, but only in body and in flesh: 384 for if the soule of Christ had bene killed, then had it bene mortall. Therefore Athanasius, Epiphanius, and all the Fathers, which did confute the Heretiques called Damœrite and Appolinaris, which denyed Christ to haue a soule, do confute them by this place, proouing that his spirite was among the spirits, that his soule seperate from his body, 385 was among the soules seperat from their bodies. This interpretation, you 386 see is gathered out of Gods word, & is made more manifest by 387 the wordes following: τοις εν φιλακη πνευμασι πορευθεις εκηρυξεν, which we translate. In which sprite he went and preached to the 388 spirites in prison, 389. First you translate ω by the which. But in the 1. pet. 16. you do not so translate it, nor in the 2. Chap. and 12. ver. the same words εν τω are Eph. 1. 13. 2. 22. 5. 18. 390 and so could I cite at the least, an hundreth texts in the new Testament, where if you translat ω. by the which, or by whome, you shall ouerthrow the meaning of the holy ghost. The next word construing, to po-

378. Betwene these two * markes ther is a most disordered *hyperbaton*, of manie wordes, & not two lines together directed to one purpose.

379. Peter sheweth not.

380. This is foisted in the text.

381. That proueth not that *spirit* is the soule heere.

382. You beg the question.

383. He suffered the death of both. You leaue the word of the text (mortified) and chose a word, that taketh away the duble death which he suffered this is peltine with the text.

384. True, but who saith so.

385. And wer all the soules seperated from their bodies in the hell of the damned: that he could not bee amongst such soules but in hell. 386. True lie, I see it not. 387. I see not that, neither.

388. τοις εν φυλακη implyeth the Participle ουσι, & cannot stand without it. Wherfore if you had cast an eie that way, you would haue translated it, that nowe are in prison. 389. You dream, we translat it not (by the which) 390. And you did, you wold lose your labour.

περιοδος which as I haue saide before 391 so I a-
nouche still, is spoken not of the deity neuer in all the
Scriptures, 392 and therefore must needes be spo-
ken of the soul of Christ. To conſute this, you alleadg
Gen. 18. 21. Exod. 3. 8. First, I must tell you these
bookes were written 393 in the Hebrewe tong and
not in the Greeke, I craued an instant out of the 394
new Testament. Secondly, in those places that you
haue named ỳ interpreters do trãslate *Iarad* by ỳ greeke
word 395 καταβαινω ερχομαι, not 396 ελθω, ꝛ not by
πορευομαι. And this I proue, Iohn. 16. 7. ἐαν γὰρ ἐγὼ μὴ
ἀπελθω, ὁ παρακλητος οὐκ ἐλευσεται πρὸς ὑμας ἐαν δὲ πορευθω
πεμψω αὐτον πρὸς ὑμας. 397 For if I shall not depart
the comforter wil not come vnto you, but if I shal de-
part, I will send him vnto you. Heere you see when he
speaketh of the descending of the deity, he vseth ỳ word
368 ελευθω but when he speaketh of the humanitie
πορευθω. 399 And in the same chapter verse the 28.
ἐξηλθον παρα τοῦ πατρος καὶ ἐληλυθα εἰς τον κοσμον· παλιν ἀ
φιημι τον κοσμον καὶ πορευομαὶ πρὸς τον πατερα. I came
out from the Father and cam into the world: againe,
I leaue the world, and goe to my father. 400 And
this propriete of speach which the holy ghost vseth,
ought to be obserued. I confesse the scriptures vseth
the figure *Anthropopatheia* 401 but when God is said
to come downe, there is vsed the verb ελευθω, or some
one of the forenamed, and when mention is made of
πορευομαὶ, it is alwaies spoken of the humanitie 402
as

391. You said that no verb of motion could be giue to the Deitie, fol. 11 pag. 2. That I hope you are gone from. Now you haue no reason, why this word cõ-not pertaine to the Deitie, but because it cannot pertaine to the Deitie, which is as if a man would say, D. H. could not get a Bishoprick, because D. H. coulde not get a Bishopricke.

392. That is not of necessitie neither.

393. Are they the fitter for that, to speak improperlie of God.

394. Why mã, is the old testament Apo-

crypha with you: you are a nice man. 395. *Katabaino* and *erchomai* be verbs of motiõ, as well as *poreuomai*. 396. *Eltho* I neuer red nor you neither in the present tense. 397 How can this place proue that? Iohn translateth not IARAD heere. 398. *Eleutho* is out of vse. You shame your self. 399. This place proueth your translating of IARAD, as the other doth. And heere you may mark that *erchesthai* is spoken of the manhood as well as *poreuesthai*. and so by your reason, *erchesthai* cannot pertaine to the Deitie, more then *poreuesthai*. 400. Proprietie of speach: alace fillie man, see the answer. 401. A vaine dreame. 402. Doth anie of these places affirme your assertion?

as it is to be seen Luk. 4. 30. 9. 51. 52. 56. 57. Luk. 13. 22. Ioh. 8. 1. And in this place of Peter, the last verse, is vsed the same word πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν He went vp into heauen. 403 Therefore, if you can quote but one text in the new Testament, that πορεύομαι is figuratiuely applied to the deitie, your interpretation may 404 seeme tolerable: but if you can not (as I knowe 405 it is impossible) then can you neuer proue your interpretation to 406 be agreeable to faith, because it is not agreeable to ye word. But of the next word ἐκηρύχθη this I note: he that was killed 407 and quickned, did preach: but Christ was killed and quickned, *ergo*, Christ, &c 408 not the deitie preched. He preched not vocally, for he was 409 killed, *ergo*, he preached 410 really in soule: for here is noted. First, who preached? Christ. To whom? to the spirits. Where? 411 in hell. When? 412 after his death, and before his resurrection. 413 This is the order of Peter, and of our Creede, which cannot bee by man ouerthrowen. The word πνεύμασι, that is spirits also, is not as you take it, 414 for you say it signifieth the men in *Noahs* time, but you can not bring one scripture to proue it. 415 Therefore, I say as I said before, it signifieth soules seperated from the body. That my exposition is true, I haue prooued by three Scriptures. Eccles. 12. 7. 416 Heb. 12, 23, Act. 7, 59. Now, as mine is true, so will 417 I proue yours to be false & impossible by Christs owne words. Luke. 24, 59. where our Sauiour, to proue himselfe to bee noe ghoste, but to haue

403 I haue quoted 8. and could haue quoted 20. see the answere. But with what face can you challenge a place of me, that is so vsed, when you can bring neither reason nor place to the contrarie 404. wil it but seem tollerable, when I haue done then it is better alreadie, for now it is a known truth. 405. Your knowledge was but ages, and I haue be guiled you. 406. I haue proued it both agreeable and necessary which I needed not. I stand at defence. It was your part to proue, which you cannot do, if you had 7. wits as good as your owne. 407. Ware sheep, that is against the text: that wherein he was mortified preached not. 408. Christ, and not his Deitie? If I had saide so, you woulde haue exclaimed vpon ignorance. 409. I hope the soule wherin you say he preached, was not killed. 410. I neuer heard a reall sermon, without words. 411. That is out of the text. 412. So is that also *petitio principij* twise together. 413. You beg the question againe. 414. Where, when, and to whome said I so? 415. It followes not. 416. These scriptures proues it not. 417 You dreame, that is not mine.

haue a true body after his resurrection, thus reasoneth: Behold my hands & my feet, that I am the same handle me, for a spirit hath no flesh and bones as yee see me haue. This was Christs argument, I haue a body, therefore I am not a spirit, 418 and so I reason against you and your teachers. The men in *Noahs* time 419 had bodies, *ergo*, they could not be called spirits, 420 Euery boy can tel you in *Oxford*, that *substantia* is deuided into *corpus* and *spiritum*, and that one of these opposite *species* can not be affirmed of another. And therfore, to be short, when you can proue out of 421 the new Testament, that περιπατέω that is, iourneying, is spoken figuratiuely of the deity, or *Pneuma* that is spirit, signifieth a man ỳ hath a body. 422 I will giue you the goale, but if you will runne on this course, vntill you haue proued these 423 2. points (which you must doo, if you will haue me to recant) then take heede least you run your selfe out of breath. Lastly, the word *Phylake*, that is, prison, doth signify hel, as it is to be sene 424 Apoc. 20. 7. When a thousand yeeres shall be fulfilled, Satan shall be losed out of his prison. Thus thou seest (good reader) how 425 I haue proued my interpretatiõ out of the word of God for euery word, which 426 our aduersaries can not doo for their interpretation: therfore, thou maist 427 safely assure thy self, ours to be good and theirs to be false. And that this word prison doth signify hell, you may see *Epiphanius*, *Athanasius*, *Fulgentius centuria* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 14. Peter Martyr on the Crede Nowell in his Catechisme, Beacon in the sick mans salue, Crowley in his answer to the reasons of Pound the Papist: All these 428 old and new writers, haue al-

418. You fight with your own shadow.
419. That followes not. A man may say as well D. Hill is a wrangling spirit, as he calleth his aduersaries phantasticall spirits fol. 24. of his sermon and yet both he and they haue bodies.
420. you should haue left this to the boyes in Oxford: it is heere a deformed patch
421. You do well to holde you in that corner, but I hope you will refuse not the Canonical scripture, for al this.
422. Then I see it bootles to hope for your promise.
423. A narrow shift.
424. The thing is true: your proof is naught like al

the rest. 425. Hand-somlie: in good sadnesse D. you cannot tell howe to settle your self to proue anie thing. 426. Blush for shame, se the answere. 427. Vpon your vnsure gesse? he were mad then. 428. First you say, that they take prison for hell: & you conclude, that they al alleadge this place as you do: your pen runnes at randome.

alleadged this Scripture as I haue done, with good
429 warrant and conſcience. Now that I haue proued this my owne interpretation, I will by Gods grace proue your anſwere 430 to be friuolous. Firſt you 431 confeſſe, that killed and quickned are Participles of one tenſe, and yet you ſay, they are not referred to Chriſt at one time, this is meerlye falſe, as I thus proue: Chriſt was after his paſſion dead & aliue, or neuer; if he were neuer dead and aliue at one time, then 432 Peter ſaith not truly, if he were dead and aliue at on time then you ſpeak falſely. Now you
433 your ſelfe confeſſed that he was dead and aliue at on time a little before, and proued it out of the 2. Cor. 13. 4. He was crucified concerning his infirmity, yet liueth hee by the power of God. 434 Heere by your own words, Chriſt was aliue when he was
435 crucified: ſo may 436 I ſay w Pet. he was aliue when he was dead, & at one time. Then you ſay, the (fleſh) ſignifieth the manhode, and (ſpirite) the deitye: this alſo is vntrue, for the body may be 437 killed, but the 438 ſoule can not. Againe, ſhew me any ſcripture where 439 an and the ſam word in on ſentence and period, is taken for diuers things: for in this ſentence, In which ſpirite, hee went and preached to the ſpirits that ar in priſon, Heer the word (ſpirit) in the beginning of the ſentence ſignifieth the deity, in the latter end, the ſame word ſignifieth the 440 men that liued in Noahs time by your interpretation: but by my interpretation, it ſignifieth the ſoule ſeperate from the body in both places. For as Cirill ſaith, as Chriſt was with the liuing in body and ſoule, ſo to ſhew himſelfe a true man, his body was a mong the dead bodies, and his ſoule among 441 the ſoules. Then you auouch the preaching of Noah, is attributed to

419. Their conſcience I hope, was better then their warrant.
430. You haue promiſed that once alreadie.
431. It was neuer denied: what needs a confeſsion in a known caſe.
432. Now for your credites ſake, tell me when Pet. ſaith that hee was dead & aliue at one time.
433. For ſham M.D. ſpeake truth.
434. A tautologie.
435. But not when he was dead.
436. You will ſay that with Peter, which Peter neuer ſaid.
437. This word expreſſeth not the Greeke *thana tathein*.
438. And yet the whole mā may be mortified.
439. See the anſwere.
440. Not ſo, but the ſpirits that now are in priſon,
441. And ſoat was but not in hell.

to the whole Trinity, be it so, but can you proue that Christ after he was killed did preach in Noah, for this 442 preaching was after Christs death, 443 which is mentioned in the 18. verse, and before his resurrection, which is spoken of in the 21. verse. You goe forward and tell mee, that *pote*, doth not determine the Participle *apeitheſaſi* that is, disobedient: but *ekeryxen* that is, preached. I must tell you plaine you speak neither like a Deuine, nor a Gramarian. For 444 an Aduerb is some time put to a Participle, as Math. 2. 7. *Tote erodes lathra kaleſas tous magous.* Then Herod calling priuily the wise men. Sometime to a Noune 445 as *homo egregie impudens.* Somtime to an Aduerb as *parum honeſte ſe gerit.* Therfore the Aduerb *pote*, comming 446 after *apeitheſaſi*, next & immediatly, and being distinguished from *ekeryxen* by 447 a Comma, cannot by any example in diuinitye, or by any rule of Grammer be 448 coupled with the verb *ekeryxen* 449 Now to answer your infallible reasons. First you reason against me, that if my construction bee true, 450 then nothing did happen to Christ which might not be verified of any man. 451 And did you not blush whē you wrote these things? 452 Can any mans soule goe to hell, and returne againe? For his going downe to hell 453 I proue in the 19. verse, and his returning from 454 hell in the 21. verse: Secondly, you say the word spirit doth signifie that which gaue life, what then? as God giueth life to the body effectually, 455 so the soule giueth life to the body formally. 456 Your Geneua translation

442. How proue you that?

443. The death and resurrection of Christ, & his preaching in the dayes of Noah, ar heer mentioned *obiter*, and as occasions led them in, & expresseth not the order, when they were done. If this reasoning be good, the passion is the beginning of the 4 cap. following the ascension, expressed in the last verse of the third.

444. But most commonlie with a verbe.

445. This is like *ſalue Domine*, I am glade to see you wel.

M.D. begins with greek cut

of the new Testament and ends in latine out of the English accidents. 446. Euerie aduerb affecteth not the word it standeth by. 447. Put out that *comma*, it is an vsurper. 448. Nor separated from it. 449. That promise is twise made now. 450. I said that nothing is spoken of Christ in these words, (mortified in the flesh, & quickned in the spirit) which may not, &c. 451. Did you not blushe to rack my wordes to the whole discourse, which are spoken but of one member. 452. No forsooth. 453. 454. those be without my bounds. 455. That is, the forme giueth life forme to the bodie. 456. Why mine more then yours.

which you follow, saith hee, was quickned 457 in the spirite, not of the spirit. And this I note against your side, *en* 458 in the 18. verse you translate (In) But in the next verse, as though you had not done well in the former, you translate it 459 (by) Now you know the prepositiõ *dia*, signifieth (by) and not *en*, as it appereth in the 21. verse and in many places mo. 460 *dia anastaseos*, that is, by the resurrection. Moreouer, if you had said quickned 461 of the spirite, then had you made a probable answer: but no diuine is able to proue this exposition, that Christ was quickned in the spirit: that is, in the deity, for the deity is like it selfe. Your third pregnant reason is, that *thanatotheis*, signifieth not only the death of the body, but also the whole passion of Christ. 462 This can not be, for the 463 sufferings of Christ are set downe before, in the same verse: then in this word, *thanatotheis* is shewed the maner of the death, that Christ suffered, that is, hee was 464 killed, and suffered a violent death. For *thanatotheis* being deriued of 465 *thanateo*, must 466 needs signifie put to death. Now I hope you will not say, Christ was put to deth in 467 soul & body, but in body only. And wher you say, that Christ suffered in soule aswell as in body, that is true, & that is gathered 468 not of *thanatotheis* ỳ is killed, but out of these words antecedent (for Christ suffered the iust for the vniust,) 469 No reasonable man but hee will say, that the sufferings of Christ, are comprised rather in the word (suffered) then in ỳ word (killed.) To your 470 fourth reason I reply, that Christ was raysed from the dead, but it is specially signified in the word resurrection, ver 21. & 471 therfore I do not confound those things that are distinguished, but

457. So say we
458. *En* is not in that verse at all expressed.
459. You dreame.
460. You promise to proue that *en* signifieth not by, & proue that *dia* signifieth by: this is cõmon with you, & a cunning point.
461. You say it cannot bee so taken: and would that answere seme probable?
462. A flat negatiue, for an instance.
463. A tautologie.
464. I haue said that this worde fitteth not the greek
465. A Passiue participle frõ a verb actiue.
466. Why so?
467. But I will say he suffered death in soule and bodie.
468. But why not?
469. What reason should moue a reasonable man, to denie that Christ suffered the death of the soule.
470. This will not answere my reason.
471. A confused negatiue of confusion. Put your antecedents to this (therfore) if your skill can do so much,

but your selfe: 472 for you make suffered and killed all one, 473 and quickned and the resurrection all one, and so mak not only a confusion, but a tautology and needelesse repetition which neuer 474 was read in the word of God. To your first argument, where you say, *zoopoieisthai* is to receaue life, I confesse it is to be made aliue. Then you vrge, it can not be spoken of ẏ soule which neuer lost life: Then by ẏ same reason more strongly, it can not be spoken of the 475 Godhead, which hath, doth, & shal liue for euer: for God cã not receaue life, but ẏ soule is said to liue, 476 when he is out of the body, not because he liued not before, but 477 because ẏ body doth hinder ẏ actions of the soule, Iohn. 11.25. 478 He that beleeueth in mee. though he were dead yet shall he liue. Sap. 9, 15. 479 The corruptible body is heavie vnto the soule, & the earthie mansion keepeth downe the minde that is full of cares. 2. Cor. 4, 16. 480 Therfore, we faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet our inward man is dayly renewed. Heere 481 Paul sayth, the weaker the body is, ẏ stronger is his soule, 482 therefore the death of the body is the life of the soule. To drawe to ane ende, your Antithesis of the 483 Deuinitie & humanitie is answered before. For your Antitheſis must be of things contrary, or at the least diuers 484 and seperate, but as you affirme truly, the Godhead was never seperated from the humanitie: 485 therefore this antitheſis is of the body and soule, which at this time were deuided, and not betweene the deity and humanitie which were alwaies vnited: 486 wherfore, this bulwarke I can assure you

472.473. where M.D. thé were I worthie to weare a bable A rogue burned in the ear suffereth, but is not killed. 474. Vntruth D. the scripture vseth manie tautologies to help our memories and vnderstanding: though this in mens writings be a fault, in scripture it is most necessarie, that one place may help another. 475. This answere were somewhat if you could make it good that we giue this participle to the Deity. 476. The question is, whether the soule is quickened, or made to liue, when it is out of the

2

bodie. 477. *Non causa pro causa.* 478. 479. 480. These places proue not the question 481. Paull saith not so heere. 482. It followeth not. 483. The *Antitheſis* there expressed is between mortified and quickned. 484. But diuerse, but not alwaies separate. 485. This therefore is builded on the wrong side of the way. 486. You call it in your margent *fortissimum argumentum*, but it is a starued shrimpe. It cannot stand though it be not touched.

you will ſtand, and you haue ouerthat both it, & your ſelf in attempring to ouerthrow it. For the very ſcope of the Apoſtle is this, all Chriſtians muſt ſuffer afflictions for well doing, for Chriſt did not only ſuffer both in body and ſoule, but alſo was put to a shameful death in his body, 487 and in his ſoule went 488 downe to the ſoules in hell, which were vnbeleeuers in the dayes of Noah: but Chriſt did ariſe againe from hel, and the graue, and aſcended both in body & ſoule to heauen: therfore, thal you, that ſuffer for wel doing, be deliuered from death and hel by his merits, and goe vp into heauen, and be partakers of his glory, as you haue ben partakers of his affliction Moreouer, as you reſerue mee to reade Bezas greate notes one this text, ſo I pray you to reade Aretius handling this place, whoſe words are theſe. Generally (ſayth Aretius) Per. repeateth three effectes of Chriſts death, if you marke it wel. The firſt pertaineth to the damned, The ſecond to the elect. The third the perſon of Chriſt. The firſt was declared in his deſcending in to hell. The ſecond in his reſurrection. The third in his aſcention into heauen. This is the true and naturall meaning of this place which wee will follow, leauing the intrications of other interpretations. I willingly confeſſe this place is very hard, for Auguſtine doubteth of it, & Luther douteth of it how it is to bee vnderſtoode, but this obſcurity ariſeth not of the place, but of the varietie of interpretations. If thou marke the plainneſſe of the place, the matter will be eaſye, but that pleaſeth not all men: therefore that euery on may eſtablish his owne ſence, they apply the words of the Apoſtle Peter to their owne conceit. But leauing theſe, let vs imbrace that which the words do teach vs: in the which, if we attaine to the truth, it is well: if not, yet they ſhall bee probable, becauſe they haue warrant out of the ſcriptures, and

leaue

487. Be ſure that that be one.

488. That is out of the way: Chriſts going downe to hel is no perſuaſion for vs to ſuffer afflictions.

leane to the very letter *to rete*, otherwise it is certain, the knowledge of man to be unperfect in many questions of holie scripture, of the which the Apostle doth warne vs, 1. Corin. 15. For now wee knowe vnperfectlie. I haue sayd here is declared three effects of Christs death which differ in time, I haue set in order in the Creede. The first effect is, that Christ being dead, denounced eternal paines to the wicked in hell. The wordes of the Apostle are these, In which spirite he went and preached to the spirits detained in prison. I take the place simply of the descence into hell, for so the wordes do plainly sound, and I see al the Fathers so to interpret them: Augustine Epist. 99. and Ciprian doth manifestly interpret this place of the descending into hel. Neither doth the word prison hinder this Interpretation: which in the Apocal. 20. 5. is taken for hel. When a thousand yeers shal be fulfilled, Satan shall be losed out of his prison. Therefore, the prison that Peter heere speaketh of, is the place deputed to the damned. Hyther came Christ, as we confes in the Creede, He went downe into Hell. 489 where Hell is, it is a foolish & curious question to enquire, sith no man coming to that place euer returned but only Christ. Furthermore, what Christ did there, Peter expresseth, he preached to the spirits, that is, he declared that he shewd himselfe manifestly to the world and made that dire and mornefull sermon, namely, to ỳ wicked, that the merit of his death did nothing pertaine vnto them, but by his presence, were confirmed those punishments of the which Noah and other prophets had forwarned them. And the tyme of this Preaching, I referre not to the tymes of Noah, but to the tyme of hys descending into Hell. Whereunto agreeth the worde *pneumasi*, that is, spirits, for hee preached to the spirits, that is, to dead, and not to liuing men. Thus farre Aretius. 490 I could heere al-

489. But you make no dout but that hel is vnder the earth, in your sermon fol. 20 pag. 2. in print

490. You should waste winde, and break your promise.

alleage many other newe Writers, whiche are of my iudgement, but becauſe you yeelde them no credite, therefore of purpoſe I will omit them.

Hvmes *his Reioynder to the* 12. *ſect.*

THis berrie is ſo confuſed, that I can not finde where to enter my ſirret. Firſt, I prooued that *Beza*, whome we follow in this place, doth no violence to the wordes: but vſeth them as hee findeth them vſed by Iohn, Paull, and Peter. Which foundation beeing laide, I anſwere your 10. reaſons, and put other 10. to the other ſcale, to counter-weigh them. You neither defend your owne, nor anſwere mine, in order as they ly: But like a mad Dog, ſnatch heere one, and there another, and let them goe, that you cannot bite. I cannot follow your ſteppes, they be ſo crooked. Wherefore, I will walke on my firſt ſteppes, and ſeeke your anſweres, where I can finde them. That which I ſay of the vſe of the words, you confeſſe, and diuers of my reaſons, you ſlip without an anſwere.

1. Reaſon. The firſt of my reaſons was from theſe wordes, (mortified in the fleſh, and quickened in the Spirit) Thus, If (fleſh) heere doth ſignifie the body, and (ſpirit) the humane ſoule: then nothing in theſe words is ſpokē of Chriſt, that may not be verified of other men. But in theſe words ſome ſingular matter is attributed to Chriſt, that other men are not capable of: For, we cannot ſay, that *Auguſtine*, *Ierome* or *Cyprian*, are mortified in the fleſh, and quickened in the ſpirit in that ſenſe, as it is heere ſpoken of Chriſt. *Ergo*, (fleſh) is not the bodie, and (ſpirit) the humane ſoule of Chriſt. That which you anſwere of his deſcēding into Hell, and returning thence, is not compriſed in theſe words, wheron my argument is builded,

Anſwere. Reply.

though

though you gaue them your owne liverie, and cloathed them in your owne cullours.

The second was this. The Spirit heer doth signifie that, which gaue life to that which was dead. But the humane soul gaue not life to that that was dead, *Ergo*, the spirit doth not signifie the humane soule. Heere you denie the *maior*, and alleadge against the Geneua Bible, which you call ours, and should bee yours as well as ours, if you and others of your sise, did not lightlie bookes nowe, that you haue highlie estemed heertofore. But it makes nothing against vs. We interprete these words as that Bible doth, Mortified in the (flesh, and quickned in the spirit,) that is mortified as hee was man, and quickened as hee was God by himselfe. According to that of Iohn. I haue power to lay downe my life, and I haue power to take it vp againe. Take your note of (in) and (by) and make a wheele-barrow of it. But you moue me heere another question of some importance: and craue an instance (if I can) in all the Scripture. Howe one word in one period can carie two significations You are not (I hope) so verie an novice in Gods booke, as you make your selfe. Haue you not read, Let the dead, burie their dead: Or, labour not for the meat that perisheth, but the meate that lasteth, &c. Or, Who so will saue his life, shall lose it. Or *Abraham* rejoiced to see my day, and saw it. Or, God is a spirit, and will be worshipped in spirit, wher you haue the same word in both significations. O howe you would be-slouen mee, if you could finde such a hole in my hose! Now, I feare nothing, but that you craued an instance out of the olde Testament.

2. Reason. Answere. Reply. Iohn 10. 18. Math. 8. 22. Ioh. 6. 27. Mar. 8. 33 Ioh. 8. 55. Ioh. 4. 24.

The third was, If death, whensoeuer it is attributed to Christ in the Scriptures, compriseth the whole passion, the flesh in this text, must be the subject of the whole passion: that is, the whole manhoode of

3. Reason.

Christ. But death is neuer attributed to christ, but for the whol passiō. *Ergo*, flesh must be the subiect of the passion, that is, the whole manhood of Christ. Heer you denie the *minor*, and like a skilfull Logician, giue instance in the questiō. If you haue not forgot your olde logicke, the argument, and the thing argued should not be one. You supplie the imperfection of this answere, with two arguments against the conclusion, that death in this place cannot signifie the passion. You were taught in the schooles, if you could not answere the *maior* or the *minor*, to graunt the conclusion. But you (I see) haue either forgot, or care not for those lessons. Your first reson is, that the passion is mentioned before in the word suffred, Be it so: Yet it may bee repeated in more speciall tearmes. By your reason, in the beleef, where a repetition is lesse tollerable, crucified and died, belong not to the passion, because they are expressed before in the word suffered. Suffering, which may be in torturing, whipping, and imprisonment, is too slacke a tearme, to expresse the hellish tormentes of Christs passion. The other is, if (mortified) pertaine to the soule, and bodie, it will followe, that the soule is also mortall. You tell mee out of *Athanasius* in the reply to my fift section, that by the double punishment inflicted on Adam, the soule should die the death. And I heard you preach in our Ladie Church at *Sarum*. That when it was saide to Adam, thou shalt die the death, the meaning was, he should die the death of soule and bodie. Now, if you wil apply these two significations of death to Christ: the one to the bodie, and the other to the soule: I hope this objection wil neither scratch nor byte.

My fourth reason was this. In this: *Antithesis* mortified in the flesh, and quickened in the spirite: mortified

fied belongeth not to the spirit, nor quickened to the flesh: but mortified belongs to the soule, for it died the death of the soule, and quickened to the flesh, for it receaued life againe. *Ergo*, flesh is not the bodie onlie, and spirit the humane soule. To this you answere, that Christ was raised from the dead, and that was signified in the word resurrection, vers. 21. and therefore you do not confound these distinguished things, antithetically allie opposed. But wee, that make mortified, & suffered; quickned & resurrection all one. How this may answere mee, I leaue it to the head that bred it to explane. But you do vs wrõg, we make not mortified, & suffered one, &c. Suffered and quickned as tearms more general, mortified & raised againe more speciall: expressing things more plainlie and particularlie, which were touched before more covertlie and generallie.

My fift reason was. To be quickened is to receaue life, which the thing that is quickened either neuer had, or els had loste. But the soule had life in the bodie, and neuer dieth after: *Ergo*, the soule cannot bee quickened. To this you answere nothing: but tell vs by the same reason, it can much lesse pertaine to the Deitie. Thus, thinking to wound vs with our owne weapon, you strike short, and with the back, drawe blood at your owne brow. I told you in my answere to your second objection, that quickened is not beer attributed to the Deitie, but to the whole Christ, by the participatiõ of proprieties. How can you excuse your self heere of wilfull falsifications? But you mend the matter, with a more sufficient answere out of Ioh. That the soule of the beleeuer liueth, though hee were dead. What then? Iohn telleth not your tale, that the soule of the beleeuer is quickened when hee is dead: That it liueth, is not the question. The burden of the bodie, which you alledge out of the book

5. Reason.

Answere.

of Wisd. loadeth the soule, but killeth it not. And therfore, when it is deliuered of that load, it is not quickened, but relecued. And the renewing of the inward man, which you alleadge from Paule, quickneth not the soule, being dead: but addeth courage and comfort, to the living and languishing soule by Gods promises. Heere I see you are quite thrust frō your hold at Chippenham, that to bee quickned is, to bee deliuered from miseries. Ingenuitie woulde haue confessed a fault. You conclude with a confutatiō of the *Antithesis*, between the divinity & humanity: but my reason is frō an *Antithesis* between mortified & quickned, flesh & spirit: which you (by a corrupted glose) taking quickned for a deliuerie frō miries, did ouerthrow. Yet because I said that Paul maketh that *antithesis*, Rom. 1. It shal not be impertinēt to view your reasons. An *Antithesis* must be (say you) of things opposite and contrarie. I add, the Diuinitie and humanitie bee thinges opposite: *Ergo*, there may be an *Antithesis* of the Diuinity, and the humanitie. But they are vnited, say you. What then? So be the flesh, and the spirit; and yet Christ saieth, the Spirit is readie, but the flesh is weake. A common Logician, (much more a Doctor) should know, that no vniting of thinges, betweene which a difference may be obserued, can let an *Antithesis*, if occasion serue. Notwithstanding the vniting, a man may wel say, Christ as hee was man, was passible, as hee was God, he was impassible.

Mat. 26. 41.

To these reasons, I added more in my latine which I sent you. The spirit heere doth signifie that, which his enemies, (hell & death,) could not touch: according to the text, he was quickened in the spirit. But his humane soule escaped not the violence of his enemies: *Ergo*, the word (spirit) heere doth not signifie his humane soule. To this you make no answere.

6. Reason.

The

The ſeaventh was. This ſpirit of which he ſpeaketh heere, did preach: But the humane ſoule cannot preach: *Ergo*, the ſpirit heere, is not the humane ſoule. To this you anſwere, that he preached not vocallie, but reallie, that is, not in words but in deeds. A dumb man may preach ſo, as well as D. Hill. If you ſtand 7. dayes in the pulpit of the great Church at Sarum, and ſay nothing: there bee not 7. men within 700. myles, that wil commend your ſermon. 7. Reaſon. Anſwere. Reply.

The eight was. Whoſoeuer doth preach, he doth it either to amend the enormities of the hearers: or to inſtruct them in the waye of ſaluation. But this was not to be hoped for in damned ſpirits: *Ergo*, hee preached not in Hell, to damned ſpirits. Heere you anſwere, that he preached to reproue them of their infidelitie: but you fall ſtill in one ditch. He that reproueth infidelitie, doeth it either to mend it, or to take away excuſes: But there was no ſuch hope in theſe, that were paſt all remedie and excuſe. 8. Reaſon. Anſwere. Reply.

The ninth was. This preaching was, when the diſobedience of the hearers, was reforme-able. But this was onelie reforme-able in the dayes of Noah: *Ergo*, this preaching was not, but in the daies of Noah. This hath no anſwere. 9. Reaſon

The tenth was from the circumſtances of the text and neceſſatie *Analyſis* thereof: Which I remitted to *Beza*, who hath done that better, then I can, and whoſe notes, it is not likelie that you want, hauing ſuch a Librarie, as you ſpeake of ſect 7. You in the margent will mee to read *Aretius* and *Alſtius*. The one I haue read, and the other cannot moue mee, though hee be my countrie-man, I haue learned to preferre truth before men, what euer they be. Theſe were my reaſons, which I joined to the lawfull vſe of the words proued by Iohn, Paul, and Peter. In them (ſo ouer-ſmoked is your ſenſe) you ſmell no reaſon 10. Reaſon

at all: But tell your reader that we cannot proue our interpretations by the Scriptures, as you do yours: and yet you bring nothing for your owne, but that the words may bee so taken: and a fewe fillie conjectures answered before by mee. Nowe, having set downe mine, let mee see howe stoutlie you haue defended yours.

M. D. reasons confuted and his answere displayed.

THe first was. *Poreuthein*, (that is, went) doth signifie motion, from one place to another. But the Deitie cannot moue from anie place, being at all times, in all places: *Ergo*, *poreuthein*, is not attributed to the Deitie. To the *minor* of this argument, I answered out of the 18. of Genesis, and 3. of Exodus.

Answere.

That the God-head is saide to moouе from place to place, by a figure called *Anthropopathein*.

Reply.

You reply, that the bookes that I cite, are written in Hebrewe, And that the interpreters doe translate that hebrew word by *katabainein* or *erchesthai*, and not *poreuesthai*.

Rejoynder

As if the Hebrewe tongue, which is called *lingua sancta*, were fitter to speak improperly of God, then the Greeke, or that *poreuesthai*, had gotten some speciall licence, more then anie other verbs of motion, to be free from that figure. Yet if it will please you to read Exod. 13. 2. Numb. 14. Deut. 1. 33. Exod. 33. 3. Psal. 132. 8. Deut. 31. 3. Psal. 91. 12. Psal. 88. 7. and infinite such places more, you shall find that plaine deere of a naked q. without a cap. But suppose that I could not finde it attributed to the Deitie in all these Scriptures, yet you were not the nearer your marke. For, if you bee remembred, your reason was in Chippenham, that *poreuesthai* cannot bee giuen to the Deitie, because it is a verb of motion. Now, the *minor* of your syllogisme must be, that no verb of motion can bee attributed to the Deitie. Which *minor* being cra∫ed by my first answere, and the examples there alledged. There is no reason left you, why you rea-

reuesthai cannot be attributed to the Deitie, as well as *erchesthai*, or *katabainein*: and no reason you knowe, is too weake against ten such stout reasons, as I haue sent you, forcing this sense vpon this place.

Your next argument, was from the participle (quickned) thus. No passiue can agree with the Deitie: Quickned is a passiue; *Ergo*, it cannot agree with the Deitie. This syllogisme I granted to be good and told you withall, that wee doe not attribute this Participle to the Deitie, but to the whole Christ, by participation of proprieties, following the text which saith not, that the flesh was mortified, and the spirit quickned: but that Christ was mortified in the flesh, and quickened in the spirite. This answere you stroke off your skore.

2. Obiection.

Answere.

No reply, no rejoinder.

Your third argument, was from the tense or time of (mortified and quickned) thus. If these contraries bee attributed to Christ at one time, they note, that hee was deade and aliue at one time. But the first is true: *Ergo*, the last is true. To this I answere, denying the *maior*, That participles or verbs of one time attributed to one thing, muste needes pertaine to one time. In the beleef, wee say, that Christ was crucified, dead, and buried: where crucified, dead, & buried, be all of one tense or time, & yet agree not all to Christ at one instance of time. To this you reply, that they muste pertaine to one time, and proue your *maior* thus. Christ was after his passion dead or aliue at on time, or else neuer. If he were neuer dead and aliue at one time, S. Peter speaketh not trulie. If hee were dead and aliue at one time, then I speake falselie. In this Syllogisme is neither mood nor figure: and besides that, it standeth on a begging of the question, That Peter saieth hee was at one time deade and aliue, is the question, and you take that, as if it were granted.

3. Obiect.

Answere.

4. Objection. Your fourth reason was. If Peter saith, that the flesh was dead, and the Spirit quickened, then doeth hee shew, that he was both dead and aliue at one time. But the first is true: *Ergo*, the last is not false. The *minor* of this Syllogisme, I did denie: shewing, that it is flat against the text, which saieth not, that the flesh was dead, and the spirit quickened. But that Christ was dead in the flesh, and quickned in the spirit. This reason it pleaseth you of your courtesie to send away in secrete, without a God be with you.

Answere.

No reply, no Rejoynder.

5. Objection. Your fifth reason was. The Scripture doth join this going & preaching cloase to his passion, as if it wold say: As soone as hee had suffered, hee went and preached. I answered you, that (as) and (if) did carie too weake a consequence, in so waightie a matter. This asse sadled with an if (though hee was bred in your groũd) you thoght him not worthie to be defended.

Answere. No reply, no Rejoynder.

6. Objection. Your sixt reason was, out of the 6. of Genes. That the preaching of Noah, is there attributed to the third person of the Deitie, and not to the second. The words of that text bee. The Lord said, My spirit shall not alwaies striue with man, because hee is but flesh. Which wordes I answered you in the Latine that I sent you, that I neuer sawe anie interpreters, that doe consent with you in this exposition, and interprete these words of the third person of the Deitie. *Tremelius* and *Iunius* their judgement I set down, as that I liked best: who take these words to be a Hebraisme, sounding as if he had said, I wil not alwaies stand disputing with my selfe, what to do with these men which yeeld no frutes, but of flesh & blood: for, nowe I am determined (except they repent) to destroy them at the day appointed. Notwithstanding, granting you that it were as you would haue it, I tolde you, seeing the actions of euery person of the Deitie, are common to all three, hee erreth not that

Answere

giueth

giueth them to anie of the three. This you confesse to be true. But you ask me, if I can proue that Christ preached in Noah after his passion: affirming confidentlie, that this was attributed to him of Peter, after the passion. It were requisite that you had good proof according to the waight of this case, and your confidence in speaking it. But I will ease you of that burden. Proue it out of the text, with anie reasonable shew of truth, and you shall haue my hart and hand. The order of the wordes which you stand so stoutlie vpon, is not so strict, as you would haue it. For the purpose and drift of the Apostle heere, is to perswade vs to patience by the example of our Sauiour, and not to set out his death, descending and resurrection, in order as they were done: but *obiter* as they fall in hand, and followe the matter that heere he driveth to perswade. Reply. Rejoynder.

Your seauenth reason was, if Christ was raised from the dead, by the first person of the Deitie, and not by the second: then the word spirit heere, cannot be construed of the Deitie: but Christ was raised by the first person, and not by the second. *Ergo*, &c. I might well haue tolde you, that this *minor* is absurde and flat against the plaine text, Ioh. 5. 21. Whatsoeuer thing the Father doth, the same the sonne doeth also with him. And Ioh. 10. 18. which wordes I did quote not farre before, in the defence of my second reason. I haue power to lay downe my life, and I haue power to take it vp again. But then sparing you and refraining all hard speeches, how euer they were due, I onelie tolde you, that I sawe not howe that could stand with the trueth of the Scriptures, which telleth mee, that the second person did put on man, and did not forsake him in all his distresses. You reply in the margent of your written copy, see contrarie to this Act. 4. 40. Act. 13. 30. 1. Cor. 15. 15. Which 7. Objection. Answere. Reply Rejoynder.

places I haue marked & obserued, to make nothing against my assertion. In them the raising vp of christ, is attributed to the God-head, which worketh not (as I haue noted alreadie) one person without another. Which thing, if it bee an errour, it was Iohn that seduced mee. cap. 5. 7. The Father worketh, and I work. As the Father doth raise vp the deade, so the sonne likewise, doth raise vp whome he will. And in the 17. verse, quoted a little aboue. The same is agreable to other infinite places of Scripture, and the somme of our Faith, called the beleef, which saieth; the third day hee rose againe, and not that hee was raised againe.

8. Objection. Your eight reason was. If the time that they were preached to, and of their disobedience, was not one: then this preaching is not to bee vnderstood of Noah his preaching, in the time of their disobedience.

Answere But the adverbe *pote* doth distinguish those times. *Ergo*, &c. To this I answere, that the Adverb *pote*, doth not determine the participle *apeitheſaſi*, but the principall verbe *ekerryxen*, You replie, that I speak neither

Reply. like a Divine, nor like a Grammarian. To proue me no divine, which indeede I am not: and no Grammarian, which I am but little: you alledge no Diuinitie, and little grammer. It will not followe, that because it may stand with a Participle, therefore it is so heere: or, that because it is distinguished from the verb, with a *comma*, therefore it cannot determine it at all.

Rejoynder You are not ouer-loden with Grammar, if you knowe not, that diuerse and manie reasons, may part wordes depending one on the other, by a *comma*. And as for this place, *pote*, if it did depend (as you would haue it) vpon *apeitheſaſi*, it cannot bee distinguished from *ekerryxen* with a *comma*, seing *apeitheſaſi* it self, is gouerned of *ekerryxen*, without commixture of anie interiected member to parte them. What

euer

euer your book hath, take heed, that it be not a ſtain to your skill in grammar, to credite a book in ſuch a caſe.

Your ninth argument was. Noah preched to men. Theſe were ſpirits & not men: *Ergo*, Noah preached not to theſe. I anſwered, that whoſoeuer preacheth to men, preacheth to ſpirites, becauſe no men want ſpirits, that is, reaſonable ſoules. And now I ad, that they are heer called Spirits, in reſpect of their impriſonment, not in reſpect of his preaching. If hee had called them men, then the name of priſon wherein they are now detained, had beene improper. The Apoſtle wiſelie chooſed that worde, which might beſt agree with both thoſe times. *Bezaes* opinion alſo, whereto *Andradius* the Papiſt agreeth, is moſt probable, that *pote* doth determine the ſame Participle *apeithesasi*, and doeth diſtinguiſh it from *tois en phylake pneumasi*, which muſt needs be vnderſtood in the preſent time, by vertue of the participle *ousi*, in that kind of phraſe in Greek, moſt neceſſarily alwaies implyed. You reply not one worde to the purpoſe: but charging vs with that we neuer ſpake, nor thought (that we take theſe ſpirits for the men in Noahs time) you alleadge Chriſts words againſt vs, Luk. 24. 39. But if you were a man, that coulde marke the wordes of them that diſpute againſt you, & take them as they are ſpoken: you ſhould finde, that wee ſay not that hee preached to the ſpirites in the dayes of Noah: But to the ſpirites that nowe are in priſon, and were diſobedient in the dayes of Noah. If you can anie waies turne Chriſts wordes in Luke, to confute this, you neede not to care, what thinges you take vpon you to proue. If you can proue, that Noah preaching to the men of his time, did not preach to their Spirites: or that theſe ſpirits in priſon, which Peter ſpeaketh heer of, were not the ſame that rebel-

led in the dayes of Noah, you may driue vs from this holde: otherwiſe you may throw your cap at vs.

10. Objection. Laſt of all, you charge our conſtruction with violence. I anſwered, that you do vs wrong, charging vs with things, that none of vs do ſpeak. Which anſwer

Anſwere you paſſe by with ſilence, and ſo allow it for currant.

To theſe you haue added two new ones, which (to take away all ſcruple, I will anſwere alſo.

11. Objection. Firſt, ſay you, if the word *phylake* doth ſignifie hel, then Chriſt did deſcend into hell: But *phylake* doeth ſignifie Hell. *Ergo*, &c. I denie the *maior*, it will not follow, though *phylake* doeth ſignifie hell (as heere it

Anſwere. doth indeed Metaphoricallie) that therefore Chriſt deſcended into Hell: neither doth the place that you quote of Math. proue that you would haue: except you can proue alſo, that *phylake* hath no other ſignification, then the priſon of vtter darkneſſe, &c.

12. Objection. Your other reaſon is. He that was killed, dead, and quickened, did preach. But it was Chriſt that was killed, dead, and quickned: *Ergo*, it was Chriſt that preached, and not his Deitie. Chriſt, and not his Deitie, M. Doctor? Can Chriſt preach, and not his Deitie? You may ſay what you will. If I had let fall ſuch a word, you would haue cried, *Crucifige*. But to an-

Anſwere. ſwere you, I denie the *maior*. It is againſt the text. He was mortified, that is, killed and dead in the fleſhe, and that preached not. Hee was quickned in the ſpirite, and in that hee went and preached. That which preached, was neither killed nor dead: neither was it ſelf quickened: but Chriſt was quickened in it.

Theſe are all your objections. In my anſwere to your ſermon, I anſwered 10. of them. You haue replyed to 6. of them, and to the other 4. you haue giuen a pardon at large, neuer to be troubled by you. Your ſix replyes I haue heere rejoyned too, and haue met your newe ſupplies at the encounter, and haue

ſent

sent them home to you for new help. All your forces thus defeated, and so mightie and resolute an armie against you, (if there bee anie conformitie in you, if your neck be not so stiffe, that no bridle can turn it) I hope you will get you to *Chippenhames* pulpit, and performe your promise.

HYME *Sect.* 13.

THese things being thus, I pray you (good M.D.) seeing you woulde haue vs vndoubtedly to beleeue, that Christ descended into Hell. Tel vs vndoutedly to what ende he should descend thither. I trust you will not teach vs, neither Augustine, neither Ieromes lesson, that he went thither to deliuer prisoners. As for that new lesson, that he went thither to triumph: it standeth not with the maner of conquerours, to shew the glorie of their conquest amongst the conquered: but amongst them to whom the ioy of the victorie doth appertaine: and for mine owne part, I haue oftentimes read the name of Hell, ioyned with shame and ignomie: but to this day, I neuer hard it ioyned with triumph and glorie. Whether seemeth it probable, that if Christ had purposed to shewe the pompe of his conquest, he woulde haue done it before his resurrection, lest being yet in the handes of his enemie, he had mett him with the proverbe, *Ante victoriam, &c.* To these reasons, may be added, that seeing his triumph was celebrated at one instance, in Heauen, Earth, and Hell: if the presence of his soule was required, as you beare in hand it will followe, that his soule was at one instant in these three places, which is contrary to the nature of a soule. You adde two other causes, to binde the deuill, and deliuer vs from hel. You bring vs many places of Scripture, to confirme this geare. Gen. 3. 15. *The seed of the woman shal breake the Serpents head.* Ose. 13 15.

15. *O death, I will be thy death, O hell I wil be thy destructiō* 1. Cor. 15. 55. *O death, where is thy sting, O hell where is thy victorie.* In all which places, there is not a sillable sounding, that Christ descended into hell. As for his triumphing ouer Hell, we neuer denied it, and do auouch that he performed, that moste gloriouslie, by the power of his God-head, which did present his victorie ouer his enemies, hell and death: both to heuen earth and Hel, without the presence of his soule.

The Paralogis. of this section.

491. Those 3 ends in your opinion, are not ends indeede.

492. He triumphed ouer hell & death in heuē, earth and hell not in hell onelie

493. If it was all one actiō to binde the Diuel, & to take away his power, that he did, by his death, Heb. 2. 14.

494. That he did by his death also.

495. *Dic sodes*: Had the Diuels neuer known his death, except he had gone

H 11 *his Reply.*

YOu aske me why Christ descended into hell, and yet you cōfes I noted 491 three ends of Christs descending into hell, the one to 492 triumph ouer the Diuels: the other to 493 binde the Diuels, and to take away their power ouer mankind: 494 the 3. to deliuer vs from hell. There was also set downe a fourth end, that is, 495 to manifest his death vnto those in hel, and to reproue them of their incredulity: and heer labouring to catch me in a snare, you are taken into it your selfe: for firste you say, Christ conquered hell on the Crosse, then as hauing forgotten your selfe you aske this question with admiration. Howe could he 496 conquer being in the graue? Is it likly that hee would triumph before his victory? Firste you stoutly affirme that he had conquered, then you boldly 497 deny it. 498 *Cōueniet nulli quæ secū dissident ipse.* Next you say, you haue not read the 499 name of hell, but ioyned with shame and infamie: why do you write then, that the 500 Godhead did triumph ouer hel; Did you not read your owne writing? I am sure in this place: 1. Cor. 15. 55. O death where is thy sting, 501. O hell where is thy victory, 502.

The

down to the damned. 496. You forge my words were, how could he triumph ouer death, being in the hands of death. 497. Not it that I said. 498. *Ast ego mihi satis consentio.* 499. So saith August. I neuer read the name of Hell *in bonam partem.* ad Evod. epist. 99. 500. 501. 502. In these places the name of hel, is separate frō triūph & glory

The nam of hel is ioined with triumph. But po answere these places with a flat negatiue. There is not a sillable to proue the descending of Christ into hell. I am sure Paule proueth heer, the 503 resurrection of Christ and of our soules, and how can he proue the resurrection, vnlesse he proue the knitting together of the body and soule? for as death is the parting of body & soule, so resurrection is the reuniting of them together againe, and here Paule sheweth that the body comming out of the graue, 504 & the soule from hell, Christ did conquere both. And therefore it is not the deity, 505 as you say, but the humane nature of Christ, y did vanquish death & hell. 506 Heb. 2. 14. For as much then, as the children were partakers of flesh and bloud, he also him selfe likewise took part with them, that he might destroy through death, him that had power of death, that is the Diuil. Therefore Hemingius on the Col. 2. saith. As on the Crosse he conflicted with the diuil, so by the glorious descending into hell, resurrection and ascention he did triumph. 507 Therefore these places proue his descending into hell as well as the burial, for the reason of y apostle is this. Christ rain out of the graue, *ergo*, he conquered death, 508 and Christ came out of hell. *ergo* he must came hell. Therefore thus I reason 509 against you, that did conquere, which did fight, but the humane nature of Christ, did fight, *ergo* it did also conquere. 510 He is gone vp into heauen, to whom the Angels, powers and mightes be subiect. 511 1. Pet. 3. 22. Col. 2. 15. phil. 2. 9. 10. Eph. 1. 20. 21. 22. Therefore, sith all these scriptures do witnes, that Christ as man did triumph, and is exalted, and hath all power, I doubt not but in your next answere you will reforme your 512 iudgement.

563. That is not his descending into hel. Frame this argument in mood & figur, and you shall be collector the next lent.

504 Wherein doth Paule shew that?

505. Where said I so, what will you blush to charge me with?

506. You haue a special grace to proue things not denied.

507. It followeth not.

508. Where said the Apostle so? Where is now *Procustes* his rack.

509. Not mee, but your own shadow.

510. If this were doutfull you conclude more, then you include in the premisses.

511. These quotations are impertinent.

512. My iudgement was neuer deformed with this scare: and therefore needeth heerein no reformation.

Hvnt his Reioynder to the 13. fect.

IBeseech thee, (good Reader) take a little paines heer, to mark the honest dealing of this D. Whet. I say, Christ could not triumph beeing in the bonds of death: hee for (triumph) sets (conquer) to make them contrarie to my former words, that Christ did conquere Hell vpon the crosse. It is one thing to cõquere, another thing, to triumph. *Pompey* conquered the mightie *Mithridates* in *Syria*, but hee triumphed at Rome amongst his freends, that were partakers of the joy. Againe, where I say with *Augustine*, that the name of Hell is joined with shame, not with honour: meaning the name of hell is shamefull, not glorious: he takes mee to say, that the name of hell cannot stand in a sentence, with a word of honour, & quotes against mee. 1. Cor. 15, 55. Hell, where is thy victorie? in which place, hell and victorie, are separated, as if hee had saide, Hell thou hast no victorie. Thirdlie, whereas I say, that Christ triumphed by the power of his Deitie: presenting his victorie to heauen, earth and Hell; he giues out that I say, that the Godhead triumphed, and not the humanitie, & notes in the margent, *Hume* contrarie to Paule and Peter: and wils mee to reforme this fault in my next reply. This is M. D. arte: If his cause were so good, as he would haue it seeme: he needed not this cunning: or, if he caried as honest a minde, as he did protest in Chippenham pulpit: hee would rather performe his promise, then seeke such vn-christian-like shiftes to maintaine a bad cause.

Aug. ad Evod. 99.

Now to answere his cavils. I ask you M. Doct. why you send Christ to hell, notwithstanding the three ends that you had noted, because those endes, were no endes thereof: and because the Scripture doeth

teach

teach, that hee had performed all those ends by the conquest of Hel, vpon this crosse. You brought texts of Scripture to proove them, and I answered truely, that not one of them soundeth anie sillable that way. For, in all those places there is not a letter, neither of his descending into hell, nor of his triumphing ouer hell. You replie, that those texts do proue the resurrection (which is not true of all neither) and that the resurrection is a knitting of the soule and bodie together: and that the knitting of them together, was no bringing his soule from Hell (this is your principle) and his bodie from the graue. Now, add the conclusion, that hee that proueth Christs resurrection, proueth his descending into hell. If this reason bee good, I will yeelde. For, now (if it will holde) you haue found a way to proue your opinion, by all the Scriptures. When Christ cured the blinde mans eies with spittle, it is plaine, that he was a man: If he was a man, he was mortall, and died: If hee died, his soule went to hel, (this is your vndoubted principle) and his bodie to the graue. *Ergo*, he that writes that Christ cured the blinde mans eies with spittle, doeth write that hee went to Hell. By this hooke, you may pull all the Scriptures out at the window, and make them proue what pleaseth you.

Hvme *his* 14. *Sect.*

YOu alledge for confirmation of the second. How can a man enter into a strong mans house and spoyle his goodes, except first hee binde the strong man. Here is not that which you vndertooke, to proove that he descended into hell, to binde the deuilles. This house whereof here is spoken, is to any man of judgments eye, by circumstance of the place, not Hell: but this worlde, whereof the deuill had ta-

ken possession, and pollated many hearts out of the which he was cast by Christ, who thereby proueth himselfe to be stronger then he: and not to woorke myracles in the name of Beel-zebub, as the Phatises did beare the simple people in hand.

His bis Reply.

The Paralogismes in the D. Reply.

513. That cānot be, see the answere.

514. How oft haue you told this tale, and neuer proued it.

515. Quote the place: these woordes are suspitious, and sound more like Hill then Cyril

516. This (for) is as doutfull, as the thing it is brought for

517. Crambe, twise at one seruice: you might haue spared it till the next course.

YOur interpretation is true: 513 and the other true also for 514 Christ did not onlie ouercome the Diuell in this world, but also in Hell. For, as Cyrill noteth on this place: there was before the comming of Christ much violence, taking away the flock of God, and carrying them to his owne house: wherefore before the comming of Christ, the heathen and people of the woorlde went into eternall death: But Christ hath deliuered both their bodies frō the graue and their soules from Hell, by his death and 515 personall descending into Hell. This place is alleadged by one Georgius Princeps Antiochenus, in his learned commentaries on the 16. Psalm, which you may read, if you please. 516 For, as Dauid trampled on the face of Goliah, 517 so did the soule of Christ trample on Satan in hell, 518 and trode on his face: and this is noted by the Prophetesse Sibilla, as also by the heathen Poets, whose woordes I haue set down in my sermon at large. And therefore Clenard in his grammer glueth this obseruation, *karelthon eis adou*, id est, *eis oikian tou adou*, he went down into hell, that is, into 519 the house of hell.

518. Euen as you haue painted it in your booke.

519. A Grecian would haue translated it, into the house of Pluto, Lord of Hell: or more Christian like into the house of death.

His bis Reioynder to the 14. Sect.

YOu graunt my interpretation to bee true: but I will not graunt yours, except you bring better war-

warrant then your self, and a man that I neuer sawe. You will mee to buy him. I am not so well purst as to buy him onlie, to see this that you quote him for, my interpretation is defend-able without him. It standeth so sure vpon the text, that you confesse it your selfe. You would faine shoulder in yours too, and make the Scriptures double tongued: but I haue learned, that one text, hath but one true meaning. Though mans opinions may differ, there is but one that hits the naile on the head. I neede no better proofe therfore, to confute your interpretation, then your own confession. Onelie this I add, that seeing your interpretation is doubtfull, it can bring no vndoubtfull proof, to your doubtfull and false opinion. As for the Sybiles, and Heathen Poets you did well to spare them. The quoting of them would haue beene more labotious, then their testimonies would haue beene effectual in this case. Whē you haue to doe with a heathen (as some of the Fathers had) they may stand you in stead, and their testimonies are not vnfrutfull. As for the greeke *eis tou adou*, you construe it wrong, into the hous of hel. Hel hath not a house. They that speak so, meant the hous of *Pluto*, called *ades* in greek: the Lord of death, as the heathen did imagine. So is that word vsed by *Nonnus* speaking of *Lazarus* raised from the death by Christ

Αιδος δε μελκη παρα γειτονι λιθῳ
παιδαματως δδαμαζον, ιδιζετο γυιον αλυτην.

HVMB *bit* 15. *Sect.*

NOw one thing remaineth, wherein you seemed to runne beyond your selfe, and most men did wonder, what you ment thereby. Whereas our Saviour vpon the Crosse, did vtter to the hearers then, & all posterities after, that he had finished the work of our Redemption: You took vpon you to proboue,

that he meant not ſo, bearing the worlde as it were in hand, that wee can ſpeake nothing ſo truelie, but that you cã confute it. To this purpoſe you alleaged theſe places, I haue finiſhed the worke which thou gaueſt me. As they had finiſhed all things that were written of him. And ſeeing all thinges now finiſhed that the Scriptures might bee fulfilled. Out of all which places (ſay you) it is apparent, that there remained ſome things to be done after. What needeth all theſe proofes in a matter that no man denieth. It is confeſſed of all men (I hope) that when hee ſpake this, he had not yet giuen vp the ghoſt. But I truſt, you will not denie, that his meaning was, that his worke was finiſhed, when hee had breathed the laſte breath. Which thing (if you grant) you haue proued nothing againſt our aſſertion. It is a common thing (you knowe) to ſpeak that in the time paſt, which is meant that it ſhall come to paſſe ſhortlie after. Such were theſe words of Chriſt, it is finiſhed. And like to them are his wordes in another place. Beholde, the houre commeth, and it is alreadie come, when you ſhalbee ſcattered. Where he ſaieth, that the houre is alreadie come, which was to come ſhortlie after. This muſt needs be the meaning of Chriſts wordes. Neither could he otherwiſe (as man) ſhewe to thoſe malitious perſecuters that ſtood about him, and vs that read it now to our comforts, that he had made an end of his worke, and was paſt the malice of all his enemies, except he ſhould haue tolde it them, after that hee had giuen vp the ghoſt. Which thing could not haue beene done, without the miraculous aſsiſtance of his God-head, which did in all his paſſion (as it were) hide it ſelf, and ſuffer the innocent man, as man, to pay the ranſom of mans redemptiõ Heere you gaue vs a diſtinction of *conſummatum re*, & *conſummatum ſpe*. Deliuer it againe, to the dunces whence

Ioh. 17
Act. 13. 29.
Ioh. 19. 28.

whence you had it. There is no haire so small, which those subtile wits, wil not finde a wedge to cleaue, rather then confes it to be a haire, if it make against their conceit, be it neuer so grosse, and erroneous. And tell those *Harpyæ quæ tactu suo optimas dapes fœdarunt*: that a thing may bee *consummatum spe*, which a man meaneth not to begin 20. yeares hence, & perhappes neuer finisthe. Heere wee all wondered what you meant, and were affraied, least you would haue sent Christ downe to Hell to suffer. Which if you did you must needes argue him of an vntrueth, who is trueth it selfe. For his worke had then beene so farre from an end, that hee had not beene flea-bitten in respect of that, which was to come. This trulie M. Hill, was not ware worthie of your wit.

HILL *his Reply.*

519 HEer you haue spoken much and proued nothing, 520 for of those reasons which I haue laide downe in my Sermon concerning this point, not one is answered. Onely as you tolde mee before 521 I was immodest, so now you tell mee 522 I am a mad man, and the wonder of the world. 523 I must answere you with Dauid, I am become as a monster vnto many, but my trust is in thy lawe. 524 But what will men Judge of you, that in one and the same matter affirme and deny. 525 You confesse in the begining, that there remaine somewhat to doo, and in the ende you wonder at mee because I sayd, al things were not finished on the crosse.

The Paralogismes in this sect.

519. What I haue spoken is either proued, or needs no proof.

520 I knowe but one reason in all the sermon vnanswered, and that was not worth an answere.

521. 522. Both vntrue. He is not well in his wits that could pike such a mad sense out of so tame words. 523. I objected no thing to you. I pray God you vse these words as Dauid did. I wish you no more ill. 524. Your malice is sharper then your accusation. 525. There remained somewhat whē he spake these words, and nothing after his death on the crosse, are not contraries, if both your eies could looke one way.

Your next wordes are these, whē our Sauiour cryed it is finished, he had not giuen vp the ghoste which was the end of his worke. 526 It is true, that after the speking of *Consummatum est*, it is finished, he gaue vp ỹ ghost, 527 but that was not ỹ finishing of his worke, 528 for he must also shed his blood. Heb. 9.22. Without sheading of blood their is no forgiuenes of sins. 1. Pet. 1. 19. Iohn, 1. 7. Apoc. 1. 5. 529 In all which scriptures it is set down, that we are redemed with the pricious blood of Christ. The blood of Christ doth purge vs from all sinne: he hath loued vs and washt away our sins in his blood. 530 Therefore the giuing vp of the ghost, was not the ende of his worke. 531 Heere is a fault committed by you, 532 but I will not wonder at you, nor say you are runn beside your selfe, 533 but you runn against your selfe, 534 and resist also the holy ghost. Then you scornefully reiect my destinction of *Consummatum re*, and *Consummatum spe*; that is, finished in hope, and finished in deede. I will defend it, for it commeth not out of the Diuines, 535 but out of Gods sacred word. Rom. 8. 24. it is said, 536 We are saued by hope. 537 Gal. 5. 5. for we through the spirit, wait for the hope of righteousnes throgh faith. 538 Luc. 21. 24. Lift vp your head (saith Christ to his Disciples) for your redemtion draweth nigh. 539 Rom. 8. 23. And not onely the creature, but we also which haue the first frutes of the spirite doo sight, even we doo sight in our selues waiting for adoption, even the redemption of our body. 540 Musculus on the fourth Chapter of the Ephesians thus writeth, the places are these, That we are called in hope, not in deede, & that the hope of future blessings, is ỹ stoye of our faith, as long as we are in this flesh, for we are saued, *nondum in re sed in spe*, not yet in deede but in hope. By all these scrip-

526 It could not be otherwise: for it had beene strange if hee had cried that, after that he had giuen vp the ghost.
527 Whether christs vntrue
528. That hee shed before
529. You can doe well to proue things not denied, we haue proued your strēgth alreadie.
530. I denie the sequele.
531. Or else by you.
532. 533. I thank you, you fauour me much.
534. Proue that, & I haue done.
535. It neuer grew in that soile.
536. 537. 538. 539. What makes all this or any thing heer to proue that Christ hath consummate our salua-tion *spe nō re*.
540. This is not to the purpose.

scriptures it is manifest, that 541 our consummation is in hope, and not in deed (as Musculus noteth) neither shall be actually perfited, until the day of iudgement. Therfore, I did with this distinction 542 refute the argument which is made of those that ar on your side, 543 who thus conclude. Christ sayde on the crosse (It is finished) *Ergo*, hee went not downe to to hell. By the same reason I thus argue. Christ said on ỹ crosse (It is finished) 544 *Ergo*, he did not shed his bloud, 545 nor was buried, 546 nor rose againe, 547 nor ascended into heauen to fulfill all things. Ephes. 4. 10. for if all things were then fulfilled on the crosse, what neede he to ascende, to fulfill all things. 548 Therfore, I did proue that this argumẽt of yours, did mak no more against the descending into hell, then against the shedding of his bloud, burial, resurrection, ascention or iudgement, al which are necessary to our 549 weale, and perfit consummation. 550 Farther, to proue my distinction to be true, I did then quote, that as Christ is said to be the Lamb, slaine from the beginning of the world, so the death of Christ did reach to the first beleeuers, and shall do to the last. Which consummation by hope, is so enioyed, as if wee possessed it already: for all the promises of Christ, are yea, and Amen, 2. Cor. 1. 20. 551 Therfore, I told you this argument, (It is finished) *ergo*, Christ went not down to hel was a fallacy *a dicto secundum quid ad simpliciter*. And I noted how these words were to be vnderstod. 552 First, that al the scripture and prophecies were fulfilled, for so the text noteth. 553 Secondly, it is finished, doth signifye, there is no other sacrifice for sinne: for by one sacrifice once offred, he hath made perfite all that shall be sanctified, Hebr. 10, 14. And therefore the Papists ioyning ỹ merits of Saints with the merits of Christ, doo erre most shamefully. 554 Thirdly, it was finis-

541. The question is not of our consummation: but how Christ hath consummat the work of our redemption.

542. You wold say answere.

543. We conclude not so, see the answer

544. This is a wonderful argumẽt. Christ saying, it is finished, died by shedding his blood: *ergo* he shed no blood.

545. 546. 547. These wer ad juncts, but not works of our redemption.

548. You can neuer proue it.

549. That is not the quest.

550. To no purpose.

551. But your argument wil not take that staine.

552. 553. 554. 555. 556. All these be answered, fol. 16. & 17. of your sermon.

finished as concerning all his labours and sorrowes. 556 Fourthly al his sufferings both of body & soule were ended, which he finished on ỹ crosse. 556 Fiftely, his obedience to his Father was ended, for he yelded a pure perfit, and perpetuall obedience to his Father, and therfore had al power giuen him in heauen, earth, and hel. Moreouer, I did proue this interpretation by this text, 557 1. Cor. 15. 54. Then shall be brought to pas the saying that is written, ô death where is thy sting, O hell where is thy victory, 558 and did alleage Beda, Peter Martyr, and Musculus vpon this place, all which were of my iudgement, and therefore you had noe more cause to wonder at mee, then at these learned men, whome 559 all the reformed Churches of England doe reuerence. Last of al, you seeme to charge me, as though I had sayd that Christ went downe to suffer, which thing I neuer mentioned, but that hee wente downe to 560 manifest his death, to triumph in 561 his owne person ouer the Diuell, 562 and personally to redeme vs from hell. Then you call them dunces whence I had that distinction. 563 I had it from Musculus, and Musculus from the word of God, 564 & therefore you must embrace these distinctions, or else you will speake erroneously. *Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete.* Try all things, holde that which is best. 565 This work is worthy my wit or any other Interpreters. Neither will I leaue the ware that is in my poore pack for all the treasures of Egypt.

557. That text proues it not.
558. These men deny not that he finished our redemption on the crosse
559. These be perilous words. Be there anie Churches in England vnreformed?
560. That was an obscure manifestation.
561. Who sayes he triumphed in an other person then his own?
562. Did he redeem vs on the crosse by a deputie?
563. You had it not from him, nor he from the word of God.
564. I denie the sequele.
565. Baseware it is, howsoeuer your wit and it doth agree.

An absurditie in the D. Reply.

That Christ beeing nailed handes and feete to the Crosse, died without shedding of blood.

HVME *his Reioynder to the* 15. *sect.*

OVr opinion is, that Christ vpon the Crosse, did offer a perfect sacrifice for our sinnes, and finish

the whole worke of our redemption. This we proue by his owne last words. It is finished. For, after the manner of men, who hauing brought their worke to the last stroake, say (they haue done) & withall make an end: Hee hauing borne all the malice that death and Hell could inflict, told the standers by, that hee had done. And this hee did immediatlie before hee gaue vp the ghost: because hee could not as hee was man, tell them the same after that he was dead. Neither wanted this speach great reason. It was to make full our hope, and to confirme our faith, which otherwise might haue stood in suspense. For, seeing our sinnes had deserued, not onelie the temporall death, which the beholders did see him die: but also all the deathes of Hell, which they, nor no mortal eie, could see him suffer: He tolde them himself, that hee had finished and done all, that there might remaine no scruple for vs to doubt of. Thus therefore wee reason against these men. If Christ finished the whole worke of our Redemption vpon the crosse, there remained nothing for him to do in hel. But he did finishe the whole worke of our redemption vpon the Crosse: *Ergo*, there remained nothing for him to do in hell. This Syllogisme is so strong, that you dare not denie one syllable of it. Wherfore, when I hard you in the pulpit violate the text wheron it stãdeth, I could not choose but tell you, that you ranne beyond your selfe, and made your audience feare, least you would haue sent Christ to Hell to suffer, an error indeede, but such, as some better divines then your self, that sealed the truth with their blood, to avoid the absurdities of your opiniõ, did fall into in King Edwards time, when your opinion was most generallie embraced, and confirmed by convocation. Whereas you say, that I say much and proue little. I proue as much as I intend. It was not my purpose